THE

ANTI-JACOBIN

Review and Magazine;

&c. &c. &c.

For AUGUST, 1804.

Caligula intended to invade *Britain*, but that, by his ſkittle head, ſudden repentance, and fooliſh attempts againſt *Germany*, it came to nothing. Yet he came on as far as *Batavia*, where *Adminius*, the ſon of *Cunobeline*, being, for ſome offence, baniſhed by his father, was, with thoſe few that accompanied him, by this vain-glorious Emperor, taken into protection. Who thereupon bragg'd in his letters to the Senate, that the whole iſland was yielded to him. The iſſue of this his expedition was, that he made his army march embattel'd to the ſea ſhore over againſt *Britain*, and commanded them to gather cockles, muſcles, and other ſhell fiſhes into their helmets, terming them the ſpoils of the conquered ocean; and, in memorial of this exploit, he built a high watch-tower, which was afterwards named *Brittonhuis*, and then returned to *Rome*, leaving his enemies, the *Britons* and *Germans*, to laugh at his ſtrange folly and madneſs.

MILTON'S HIST. OF ENGLAND, p. 84.

ORIGINAL CRITICISM.

Thoughts on the Calviniſtic and Arminian Controverſy. By G. S. Faber, B. D. Pp. 46. 8vo. 1s. Rivingtons, London. 1804.

THE learned author of this pamphlet has given in his title-page the 6th article of our Church, and a quotation from the Biſhop of Lincoln's late charge, each of them very applicable to his ſubject, and the latter ſufficiently deciſive, we think, of the preſent controverſy.

He begins his judicious and ſatisfactory little work by ſtating, that all extraneous matter ſhould be ſeparated from the points on which the controverſy turns, and that no doctrines ſhould be termed Calviniſtic but ſuch as belong excluſively to Calviniſm; that the Calviniſt, in maintaining ſome of the orthodox doctrines of our Church, has no right to claim them as entirely his own; and that our Church, in holding ſome things in common with Calviniſm, is not therefore to be

 conſidered

conſidered as peculiarly and properly Calviniſtic. "Both Calviniſts and Arminians (he obſerves) appeal to ſcripture in juſtification of their reſpective opinions; but it is one thing to cite a text, and another to give a conſiſtent interpretation of it." (p. 5.) and he proceeds very juſtly to reprobate the pride of opinion, the pertinacity of prejudice, the violence of party, and the folly of building up exclusive ſyſtems, and then defending them as the unadulterated goſpel of Chriſt, and the only teſt of true Churchmanſhip.

"Thus, (he ſays) the ſyſtematic Calviniſt will very logically prove, or at leaſt ſeem to prove, that man is entirely paſſive in the work of ſalvation, in other words, that he is a mere machine in the hands of that God who imparts his grace only to thoſe whom he hath purpoſed to ſave; while the ſystematic Arminian, if he puſh his principles to their utmoſt extent, after he has to all appearance no leſs logically demonſtrated from ſcripture that man is perfectly a free agent, will not eaſily avoid demonſtrating alſo that he is able by his own unaſſiſted ſtrength to perform the commandments of God. Both theſe poſitions may eaſily be maintained, with a great ſhew of fairneſs and impartiality, by arguments drawn from *insulated* texts; and it may perhaps be a difficult matter to point out the preciſe link in the chain of reaſoning where the fallacy lies; nevertheleſs, if ſcripture be attended to *as a whole*, we ſhall find ſomething true and ſomething falſe in each of them." (p. 7-8.) He then "proceeds to ſhew the two chains of reaſoning, by which high Calviniſm and certain poſitions which even the higheſt Calviniſt would tremble to admit, and by which high Arminianiſm and certain poſitions which even the higheſt Arminian would tremble to admit, may be reſpectively demonſtrated, or, to ſpeak more accurately, *apparently* demonſtrated from ſcripture." (p. 11.)

This he has done in the moſt ſatisfactory manner by ſetting forth the directly oppoſite concluſions which may be drawn from two ſeveral texts of ſcripture, if the argument be carried to its utmoſt limits.

"But (he obſerves) Calviniſts and Arminians will doubtleſs agree in ſaying, that I carry the matter much further than I have any right to do; much further than they are prepared to follow me; and moſt ſincerely do I believe the truth of their aſſertions. Nevertheleſs I would aſk the *ſystematic* Calviniſt, what right *he* has to ſtop at any *particular link* in the one chain, and the *ſystematic* Armenian, what right *he* has to ſtop at any *particular link* in the other chain? If ſyſtems *muſt* be conſtructed, the concluſions *after* theſe links are reſpectively as valid as the concluſions *before* them." (p. 17.)

We entirely agree with the learned author that the horrid nature of the principles which may by legitimate deduction be derived from the two ſyſtems in queſtion, when carried to their utmoſt limits, their inconſiſtency with, and oppoſition to, holy ſcripture, ſufficiently vindicate our articles from the charge of ſupporting any thing like this or that ſyſtem, and confirm the truth of the Biſhop of Lincoln's obſervation, quoted in the title-page, "our Church is not Lutheran, it is

not

not Calviniſtic, it is not Arminian; it is ſcriptural." He then lays down the following plain rule for the confutation of falſehood.

"Admit no concluſion in any ſyſtem, unleſs the concluſion itſelf, as well as the theſis from which it is deduced be explicitly ſet forth in Holy Scripture. This rule is equivalent to two very wiſe declarations of our Church, that whatever is not read in Scripture, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it ſhould be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requiſite or neceſſary to ſalvation; and that we muſt receive God's promiſes in ſuch wiſe as they be *generally* ſet forth to us in Holy Scripture." (p. 19, 20.)

He then proceeds to compare the two preceeding chains of concluſions, link by link, with the Bible, in order to ſhew the vanity of building ſyſtems, and the folly of contending for ſuch mere creatures of fallacious reaſoning, as far as reſpects ſoundneſs of doctrine.—— Other bad effects he deſcribes as flowing from it.

"Violent contentions for favourite opinions are too frequently the harbingers of that bane of Chriſtian meekneſs and charity, open Schiſm. Obſcure matters of doubtful diſputation acquire an importance in the eyes of a party man, which they by no means deſerve. By long brooding over them in private, by aſſociating with none but thoſe who hold the ſame ſentiments, and by reading no works but thoſe which are written on one ſide of the queſtion, his paſſions become inflamed in proportion as his judgment is unexerciſed; and he can conſider none orthodox but thoſe who think preciſely like himſelf; and who, in addition to the formularies of the Church of England, admit all the peculiarities of *his* ſyſtem."

Hence the mutual prejudices and diſlikes of the Calviniſts and Arminians.

"Such are the unhappy diſputes of the preſent day, which ſerve only to irritate the minds of the contending parties, to grieve all moderate men, and to delight the advocates for infidelity and ſchiſm." "Meanwhile, that venerable branch of Proteſtant epiſcopacy, the eſtabliſhed Church of England, purſues the noiſeleſs tenour of her way, unmoved by the din of theologic hatred, and unbiaſſed by the confident appeals of her reſtleſs children. Peace be within thy walls, and plenteouſneſs within thy palaces! Thou haſt choſen the word of God for thy guide, and may that God be thy protection in the midſt of all thy troubles! To the Calviniſt the Church declares the doctrine of univerſal Redemption. To the Pelagian ſhe aſſerts the exiſtence of original ſin. To the Antinomian ſhe declares that good works are *a ſine quâ non* of ſalvation, though not the meritorious cauſe of it; and informs him, that, though Chriſt died for all, yet none will be ſaved but the pious only. To the Latitudinarian ſhe avows, that, they are to be had accurſed who preſume to ſay that every man ſhall be ſaved by the law or ſect which he profeſſeth, ſo that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law and the light of nature. And the Romaniſt, ſhe teaches, that we are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt by faith, and neither for our own

works or deſervings, nor for the ſupererogatory works of ſaints. In fine, (to adopt the Biſhop of Lincoln's judicious remark,) our reformers followed no human authority; they had recourſe to the Scriptures themſelves as their ſole guide. And the conſequence has been, what might have been expected, that our articles and liturgy do not exactly correſpond with the ſentiments of any of the eminent reformers upon the continent, or with the creeds of any of the Proteſtant Churches there eſtabliſhed. Our Church is not Lutheran, it is not Calviniſtic, it is not Arminian; it is ſcriptural." (p. 46.)

Having thus preſented our readers with an analyſis of this judicious and convincing work, we ſhall conclude with recommending it to their peruſal and giving it the ſtamp of our hearty approbation.

One ſhort diſquiſition, however, we beg leave to ſubmit to the learned author's conſideration. At p. 39. he obſerves, that "Faith is declared to be the ſpecial gift of God," and he quotes in proof of it that text of St. Paul to the Epheſians, "By grace are ye ſaved, through faith; and that not of yourſelves; it is the gift of God." Now we admit that faith is the gift of God, inaſmuch as we admit that "every good and perfect gift cometh down from the Father of lights." But we certainly cannot admit the text here quoted to be any particular proof of it. "By grace ye are ſaved through faith, and that (καὶ τοῦτο) not of yourſelves, it is the gift of God." The words (καὶ τοῦτο) cannot poſſibly be reſtricted to the word "Faith" immediately preceding; they muſt comprehend the whole of the preceding ſentence, "By grace ye are ſaved through faith." "Salvation by grace through faith" then, is here declared "to be the gift of God, and not to be of ourſelves, nor of our works, leſt any man ſhould boaſt." We beg to refer the learned author to the original, and we think he cannot heſitate a moment to ſubſcribe to the correctneſs of our interpretation. We have ſtated it, becauſe many authors beſides Mr. F. have quoted this text for a ſimilar proof, and we think it no proof at all. Another reaſon with us for ſtating it at preſent is, the controverſy which has given birth to this little work. Mr. Overton has thought proper to charge the clergy of the Church of England, thoſe of them at leaſt whom he conſiders as his opponents, with objecting to the doctrine of "Salvation by grace through faith in the ever-bleſſed Redeemer." Now the foregoing text of St. Paul is one of the ſtrongeſt and moſt expreſs in ſupport of that doctrine; and we do not conceive how any man can be of the Church of England, or can call himſelf a Chriſtian, who denies it. We unequivocally avow and maintain the doctrine; and we unequivocally declare our belief that no clergyman of the Church of England denies it.

Godwin's

Godwin's *Life and Age of Chaucer.*

(Continued from P. 241.*)*

AS we wiſh to omit no opportunity of diſplaying the reformation which, as we conceive, has, in many inſtances, taken place in Mr. G.'s manner of thinking, we copy, with pleaſure, ſome general obſervations with which the ninth chapter of his book commences.

" There are," he ſays with great propriety and good ſenſe. " few truths more ſtriking in the hiſtory of human affairs, than that things which may be hurtful and injurious in one ſtage of ſociety, had probably their period, in a different ſtage, when they were eminently advantageous and ſalutary. *No ſpeculation can do less credit to the diſcernment of its authors, than that which, examining inſtitutions and practices in the abstract, decides indiſcriminately that this is good and univerſally deſirable, while that is fitted only to be the plague of mankind.* Every thing has its place; and it would be difficult to find any cauſe influencing the mind of man in ſociety, however now perhaps antiquated, inſipid, or poiſonous, which was not at one period genial and nouriſhing, reſtraining the ferocious and ſavage paſſions, or forwarding and maturing the faireſt offſpring of intellect. Thus, perhaps, the ſecularized and degenerate religion eſtabliſhed by Conſtantine and his ſucceſſors contributed to bring on the darkness and ignorance of the middle ages: yet that very religion, acting upon the barbarous uſurpers of the Roman empire, tended to keep alive ſome of the arts of a more cultivated period, and to prevent the darkness from becoming univerſal and complete." (p. 161.)

The ſterling merit of the general principle here laid down, we are ſorry to obſerve, is conſiderably lowered by the ill-choſen terms with which the illuſtration is uſhered in. When Mr. G. talks of " the *ſecularized* and *degenerate* religion eſtabliſhed by Conſtantine and his ſucceſſors," he uſes language at once the moſt improper and the moſt indiſtinct. It is the canting whine of a diſcontented diſſenter, who, becauſe his own opinions are not eſtabliſhed, delights to rail at all eſtabliſhments. We do not ſay that this is Mr. G.'s character: but we ſay that he ſpeaks as ſuch a character would ſpeak: his phraſeology too has as little claim to juſt diſcrimination and truth of fact, as it has to liberality of ſentiment. Whatever the religion might be which was eſtabliſhed and maintained by ſome of Conſtantine's *ſucceſſors*, and however ſecular encouragements might promote its corruption, nothing can be more falſe, unleſs Chriſtianity itſelf be an impoſture, than that the religion eſtabliſhed *by Conſtantine* was a *degenerate* religion. We are willing, however, to believe that the expreſſion was an unintentional overſight. We, therefore, paſs it without farther remarks; and, as we take infinitely leſs pleaſure in cenſure than in praiſe, proceed to topics which are more to our mind.

The ſubjects of this Chapter are the ſculpture and painting of the 14th century: the metallic arts, embroidery, and muſic. On each of theſe much curious information is communicated, and many im-

portant reflections are made. The Engliſh, it appears, were anciently dexterous in the art of working caſkets in gold and ſilver: nor do they ſeem to have leſs excelled in embroidery. Our readers may be gratified with a ſhort account of the celebrated tapeſtry of Bayeux, which was worked in England, and which has lately, we are told, been employed as one of the means beſt fitted to encourage Buonaparté's hordes to invade that country where it was produced.

"It is a web of linen, nearly two feet in breadth, and 242 in length, embroidered with the hiſtory of the Norman expedition, from the embaſſy of Harold to the Norman court in 1065, till his death in the following year. The ſcenes of this buſy period are ſucceſſively exhibited, and conſiſt of many hundred figures of men, horſes, beaſts, birds, trees, houſes, caſtles, and churches, with inſcriptions over them, explanatory of their meaning and hiſtory. This work is underſtood to have been performed under the direction of Matilda, conſort to William I, and was not improbably executed by the hands of Engliſh women, whoſe ſuperiority in performances of this kind was then univerſally acknowledged." (Pp. 164, 165.)

No nation is ſo barbarous as not to have its muſic. Profane muſic was cultivated, among our anceſtors, by the minſtrels; nor was ſacred muſic leſs encouraged and improved by the churchmen their contemporaries. When Auſtin, the monk, and the companions of his miſſion, were firſt introduced to Ethelbert, King of Kent, they approached him in proceſſion, ſinging litanies; and "they truſted," as our author ſhrewdly obſerves, "probably as much to the charms of the Roman chant, as ſettled by Pope Gregory the Great, as to the arguments of the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts, for the converſion of their idolatrous hearers." (p. 80.) During the 11th century important changes were introduced into the ſcience of muſic. The chief of theſe were counterpoints, or the method of ſinging in parts; the invention of the muſical ſcale by Guido Aretino; and that of the time table, or mode of notation, by which the relative length of each ſound is determined, by Franco of Cologne.

The character and refinements of modern muſic may be ſaid to owe their origin to theſe three diſcoveries. In commendation of ſuch refinements much may juſtly be advanced; but they ought not to make us forget the real and indeſtructible merits of the ancient muſic. The muſic of the dark ages equals that of any age or country in its power over the paſſions: "Nor has," ſays Mr. G. "any lapſe of time, or progreſs of improvement, been able to ſuperſede the favour with which muſic of this ancient and ſimple character is regarded by the maſs of almoſt every nation in Europe." (p. 181.) The reaſon of theſe facts, he adds, is obvious; and he aſſigns it in the following paſſage, of which it would be ſomewhat difficult to decide whether it diſplays the greater ſhare of good ſenſe, or of good taſte.

"In the ancient muſic, the ſounds produced by the finger or the inſtrument were ſubordinate to the words; and every man, not infatuated with the paſſion for muſic, will admit that, however rapturous or impreſſive

may be the accord of ſounds, yet the language of muſic, taken ſeparately from words, is looſe, obſcure, and enigmatical, ſuſceptible of various interpretations, and guiding us with no ſufficient deciſion to any. When we hear a tune unaccompanied with words, (unleſs that tune, by paſt aſſociation, is enabled to raiſe up in our minds the image or general purpoſe of certain words), or when we hear a tune, in which the luxuriance and multiplicity of muſical ſounds obſcures and tramples with diſdain upon the majeſtic ſimplicity of words, our attention will almoſt univerſally be fixed leſs upon the paſſion which ought to be communicated, than upon the ſkill of the artiſt; we ſhall admire much, and feel comparatively little. In a tune in which the number and time of the muſical ſounds are regulated by the Syllabic meaſure of the verſe, there will be an awful, or a faſcinating, ſimplicity, which is capable of powerfully moving the heart. Refined and ſcientifical muſic can delight no man, but from affectation, unleſs it be aided by previous habits or education. The taſte for it is conſequently an artificial taſte; and, when moſt perſeveringly and ſucceſsfully cultivated, yet its power over the mind will never riſe to ſo great a degree of ſtrength, as the pleaſures of natural taſte." (Pp. 181, 182.)

Chaucer is ſuppoſed to have ſtudied at Cambridge. The evidence of this, however, is but ſlight. In his "Court of Love," written at the age of 18 years, he deſigns himſelf "Philogenet, of Cambridge, Clerk." Chaucer *may* have ſtudied at Cambridge, and probably *did ſo*; but the fact cannot, ſurely, be inferred with certainty from a deſignation which is evidently fictitious. Mr. G. here gives an intereſting ſketch of the riſe, amazing proſperity for a time, and ſubſequent decline, of the two univerſities. In the year 1209, 3000 Members of the Univerſity of Oxford, exaſperated by ſome arbitrary proceedings of King John, withdrew to Cambridge and other places, where they hoped to purſue their ſtudies in peace. In 1357, the Archbiſhop of Armagh, in a diſcourſe delivered at Avignon before Innocent VI. affirmed that, even in his time, Oxford had contained 30,000 Scholars; though he adds that, at the time when he was ſpeaking, it ſcarcely contained 6000. This decay he aſcribes to the prodigious influx of the Mendicant Friars, who firſt obtained permiſſion to eſtabliſh their fraternities at Oxford in the beginning of the 13th century, and ſoon became ſuch formidable rivals to the Univerſity as to threaten its total ruin.

Chaucer's "Court of Love" was firſt printed by Stow, the reſpectable compiler of the Annals of England, in an edition which he gave of the poet's works in 1561. It conſiſts, at preſent, of 1443 lines, but muſt originally have conſiſted of not leſs than 2000. It is particularly examined in our author's 12th chapter, which appreciates very juſtly its merits and defects. But, previouſly to this examination, Mr. Godwin thinks it neceſſary to conſider Chaucer's claim to be conſidered as the father of Engliſh poetry. This he does in the 11th chapter; in which alſo is contained a moſt curious diſquiſition on the ſtate of poetry in Europe before the time of Chaucer, and a moſt excellent delineation of the characters of William de Lorris,

Dante, and Petrarca. Of this excellent chapter we are ſorry that we can afford to lay before our readers only a ſkeleton.

By all who have traced the hiſtory of our language Gower has, hitherto, been ſuppoſed to have preceded Chaucer as an Engliſh poet: to have adviſed him to compoſe in his native tongue, and to have ſhewed him the way. But our author has, we think, demonſtrably ſhewn that this prepoſſeſſion in favour of Gower, however general, is a miſtake. Gower is commonly thought to have been the elder of the two. But the difference, if any, could not have been great; ſince Gower was, in ſome degree, an active man and a courtier at the acceſſion of Henry IV., when Chaucer was upwards of 70. The following two lines in Gower's poem "De Confeſſione Amantis,"

> And grete well Chaucer, whan ye mete,
> As my diſcyple and my poete,

have been conſtrued to import that Gower modelled the literary character of Chaucer, aſſiſting him with his advice, and guiding him by his example. The lines, however, are ſpoken, not by Gower, but by Venus; and, from the information of Gower himſelf, we know that the "Confeſſio Amantis," the only work of his in Engliſh, was written at the requeſt of Richard II. and publiſhed in 1392 or 1393. Before that time Chaucer had produced all his great works, except the Canterbury Tales. They were already in every one's hands, and every one contended who ſhould be loudeſt in their praiſe; ſo that Gower really ſeems to have been ſtimulated to the cultivation of his native language, by the ſplendid ſucceſs and loud fame of his friend. Gower, at the age of 60 and upwards, learned to write Engliſh, which Chaucer had written at the age of 18.

The remainder of this eleventh chapter is peculiarly excellent. It treats of the poets on the continent previous to Chaucer; of the Romance of Provencal languages, which were ſeparated by the Loire; of the comparative merits of the writers in each; and of the ſingular inſtitutions called Parliaments or Courts of Love, which made a figure in the 12th and 13th centuries, and in which the niceſt queſtions of gallantry were decided. Theſe courts conſiſted of members of both ſexes, although the ladies, as was to be expected in an age when they were looked up to with a deference bordering on adoration, had clearly the greateſt weight and pre-eminence. Mr. G. in ſpeaking of William de Lorris, (ſo called from the name of the place where he was born, a town in the Orleannois) the original author of the highly popular poem the "Roman de la Roſe," has favoured us with a moſt judicious criticiſm on the French poetry of the two laſt centuries. (Pp. 221, 222.) The portrait of Dante is drawn with admirable ſpirit and truth. We ſhall copy a few of its principal features.

"Dante is one of thoſe geniuſes, who, in the whole ſeries of human exiſtence, moſt baffle all calculation, and excite unbounded aſtoniſhment. Dark as was the age in which he ſtudied and wrote, unfixed and fluctuating as

as were the then half-formed languages of modern nations, he trampled upon theſe diſadvantages, and preſents us with ſallies of imagination, and energies of compoſition, which no paſt age of literature has excelled, and no future can ever hope to excel.—Science has a gradual and progreſſive march; one diſcovery prepares the way for another.—It is not ſo in poetry. There the maſter geniuſes, a Homer, a Shakeſpeare, and a Milton, ſeem to belong to no age, but to be the property of the world. They bear indeed ſome marks of the period in which, and the people among whom, they lived, ſome token of human weakneſs and infirmity; but what is beſt in them reſembles nothing in their contemporaries, was prepared by no progreſſion, was copied by no future imitation, and ſtands off as wide from competition in all which came immediately after, as in all that had gone before it.

"Such a man was Dante. He is not infected, in his immortal part, with the weakneſs of his age. He does not march with the uncertain and half-determined ſtep of William de Lorris. His ſatire is as biting, his ſublime as wonderful, his tragic narratives [are] as deep and diſtreſſing as any which the age of Pericles or of Virgil could boaſt. His grand poem embraces the whole compaſs of human invention. He has thought proper to render it the receptacle of all his animoſities and averſions. No author has exhibited craft, and impoſture, and tyranny, and hard-heartedneſs, in bolder and more glowing colours than Dante. No poet has ſhewn himſelf a greater maſter of the terrible, of all which makes the fleſh of man creep on his bones, and perſuades us, for the moment, to regard exiſtence, and conſciouſness, and the condition of human beings, with loathing and abhorrence. Dante exhibits powers, of which we did not before know that the heart of man was ſuſceptible, and which teach us to conſider our nature as ſomething greater and more aſtoniſhing than we had ever been accuſtomed to conceive it. Dante died ſeven years before Chaucer was born." (Pp. 223-225.)

A finer paſſage than this will not eaſily be found in any author.

Into our author's examination of the "Court of Love" we cannot enter. But he has ſhewn that the verſification has great merit, and that the antient appearance of the poem preſents no very formidable difficulties, except to thoſe whoſe poetical reſearches have never been extended beyond Dryden and Pope. This is true, indeed, of Chaucer's works in general. The following aſſertions of Mr. G. will be found, by thoſe who ſhall make the experiment, to be perfectly well grounded: "All that repels us, in the language of Chaucer, is merely ſuperficial appearance and firſt impreſſion: contemplate it only with a little perſeverance, and what ſeemed to be deformity will, in many inſtances, be converted into beauty. A fortnight's application would be ſufficient to make us feel ourſelves perfectly at home with this patriarch of our poetry." (p. 248.) He complains, however, of the wretched form in which the greater part of Chaucer's works now appear. "Mr. Tyrwhitt, indeed," he ſays, "has taken much pains, and, in many reſpects, to excellent purpoſe, with the 'Canterbury Tales;' but nothing can be more miſerable than the condition of the printed copies of the reſt." (p. 245.) It is certainly very much to be deſired that a correct edition ſhould be given of the whole, accompanied

nied with exertions, by way of illuſtration, ſimilar to thoſe which have of late years been ſo liberally employed on Shakeſpeare and Milton. We would ſeriouſly recommend it to our very able and ingenious author to undertake the conducting of ſuch an edition. We are perfectly ſatisfied that, in the indiſpenſible qualifications of diſcernment, erudition, and taſte, he is well qualified for the taſk; and if he were to iſſue propoſals for ſuch a publication, we think that he could hardly fail of ſucceſs. We conceive that he would be liberally encouraged by the public, and aſſiſted by many valuable communications from thoſe whoſe ſtudies have been directed to our ancient literature.

This twelfth chapter finiſhes with ſome reflections on war, ſuggeſted by the memorable battle of Creſſey, which was fought in the ſame year in which Chaucer wrote the "Court of Love." In theſe reflections, Mr. G. appears, in our eyes, to no advantage. He ſeems equally afraid to avow and to renounce his former principles on the ſubject. "War," he ſays "in the eye of a ſound moraliſt, is the moſt humiliating attitude in which human nature can exhibit itſelf. A thouſand men *murdered* on a field, by other men to whom they are total ſtrangers, for a *miſerable* queſtion of political ſpeculation, by which, ninety-nine times out of *an* hundred, whichever party obtains the victory, no party is the gainer, is a ſpectacle to make us curſe exiſtence, and the human form [which] we bear." (p. 250.)

Why any ſpectacle whatever ſhould make us curſe the *human form* is not eaſily conceived; and from what code of laws our author derives his notion of *murder* we cannot conjecture. The truth is, that this is the *miſerable* howl of that affected philanthropy, which, we hoped, had now been univerſally underſtood: which, while it teaches us to regard all the quarrels of Kings (whom our author here, as in ſome other places, has dignified with the democratical title of *the firſt magiſtrate*,) as flagrant tranſgreſſions of the laws of humanity, can exult in the extermination of millions for the elevation of the mob, and for the unattainable phantoms called *liberty and equality*. Yet Mr. G. informs us that "war may be neceſſary, and, if neceſſary, then juſt." If ſo, he himſelf is, in our opinion, here engaged in a very unneceſſary war; for he has, as far as we know, no antagoniſt. It is certainly true that, as he obſerves, "The ſtrength of muſcle and ſinew, any more than the ſtrength of intellect and imagination, ought not to be deſpiſed, and deſerves to be cultivated." But when he ſays that, "abſtracting from the moral application of military proweſs, it is on every ſuppoſition *an energy*, and, as ſuch, is worthy of honour," (p. 251.) he talks a language which we do not underſtand. We thought that the *moral application* of an energy had been the very circumſtance which conſtituted the honour or diſhonour of the energizer; and we cannot help obſerving that the very term ENERGY might have been avoided by our author without any breach of prudence. In ſhort, we ſuſpect that theſe reflections on war will neither conciliate Mr. G's old friends, nor procure him new ones.

Mr. G. thinks it probable that, from Cambridge, Chaucer removed

moved to Oxford. Leland ſays expreſsly, "Iſiacas ſcholas-diligenter celebravit;" and mentions John Somme and friar Nicholas Lynne, two eminent mathematicians, as the tutors under whom he ſtudied. His poem entituled "The Boke of Troilus and Creſeide," a juvenile work, and compoſed before his connections with the court, is dedicated to Gower and Strode, two ſcholars, of whom both, as we have reaſon to believe, were educated at Oxford; and it was probably written during Chaucer's reſidence there, or ſoon after his quitting it. This poem is avowedly a tranſlation; and there has ariſen ſome enquiry concerning the original author, and the language in which it was firſt compoſed. Chaucer himſelf, in the courſe of his poem, calls the author *Lollius*, and the language Latin. Lydgate aſſerts that the title of the original work was *Trophe*. Mr. Tyrwhitt, however, has attempted to ſhew that the "Troilus and Creſeide" is taken from the *Filoſtrato* of Boccaccio; though how Boccaccio ſhould have acquired the name of Lollius, and the Filoſtrato the title of Trophe, he confeſſes himſelf unable to explain. Mr. Godwin here gives us a very good ſketch of the hiſtory and literary character of Boccaccio, and combats the opinion of Mr. Tyrwhitt, with ſucceſs we think, but certainly with an air of unbecoming petulance, which we are really ſorry to ſee him indulge almoſt on every occaſion where Mr. Tyrwhitt's name occurs in his work. He ſuppoſes that Lollius was an author to whom, though his work has now periſhed, both Chaucer and Boccaccio were indebted, and from whom both the Troilus and Creſeide of the former, and the Filoſtrato of the latter, were equally tranſlations. A ſtrong confirmation of his hypotheſis is derived from one of Chaucer's moſt conſiderable productions, his "Houſe of Fame." In this work the poet thus enumerates the authors who had recorded the ſtory of Troy: Homer, Dares, Titus, [Dictys], Lollius, Guido dalla Colonna, and Geoffrey of Monmouth. Beſides, Boccacio himſelf aſſures us, that he tranſlated his *Theſeida* from a Latin original. What more likely than that the Filoſtrato came from a like ſource? Tranſlation was deemed an honourable employment by the firſt revivers of learning, who were eager to lay open to their ignorant countrymen the ſacred fountains of knowledge, which had ſo long been concealed in obſcurity and neglect. Mr. G., therefore, is of opinion that Lollius may, with ſome probability, be conſidered as an author of the 12th century, who, like many others, was captivated with the "tale of Troy divine," at a period when the different nations of Europe were ſeized with the affectation of deducing themſelves from a Trojan original.

Our author's XV. chapter contains a very maſterly analyſis of the "Troilus and Creſeide," in which both its beauties and its defects are pointed out with impartial diſcrimination. Yet ſome of his criticiſms are evidently wrong. "There are lines," he ſays, "interſperſed in the poem, which are not more degraded by the meanneſs of the expreſſion, than by the rudeneſs, not to ſay the brutality, of the ſentiment." Of theſe he produces the following ſpecimen: "We may well

well be surprized, after considering the delicacy and decorum with which Chaucer has drawn his heroine, to find him polluting the portrait of her virgin character in the beginning of the poem with so low and pitiful a joke as this,

> "But whether that she children had or none,
> I rede it not, therefore I let it gone." (p. 305.)

But there is, in these lines, no joke intended. Creseide is uniformly represented by Chaucer as *a Widow*. Thus, in the first book, when the ladies of Troy are going in procession to the temple of Minerva,

> "Among these other folke was Creseida,
> *In widdowe's habite blake.*"

These lines are quoted by Mr. G. himself. To them we shall add the following charming stanza, which contains the answer of Creseide to Pandarus, when urged by him to join in a festival of pleasure:

> "Eighe! God forbid, quod she; what, be ye mad?
> *Is that a widowe's life,* so God you save?
> Pardie, you makin me right sore adrad;
> Ye been so wilde, it semith as ye rave.
> It sate me well better, aie in a cave
> To bide, and rede on holy saintis lives:
> *Let maidins gon to daunce, and young wives.*"

The sixteenth chapter gives some account of a sequel, or sixth book, to Chaucer's poem; which sequel is usually called "The Testament of Creseide" and which appears to have been written by Robert Henryson, schoolmaster of Dumfermline in Scotland, about the end of the reign of Henry VIII. It has great merit, but is deficient in delicacy, and refuses to harmonize with Chaucer's production. Mr. Godwin then proceeds to observe that the critics and commentators on Shakespeare seem hardly to consider that great poet as, at all, indebted to Chaucer for his story of "Troilus and Cressida;" although it is surely difficult to conceive that Shakespeare was not well acquainted with so celebrated a work of his illustrious predecessor. There is positive evidence, however, that with regard to this story, Shakespeare principally followed Chaucer. His other sources were Chapman's translation of Homer, the Troy book of Lydgate, and Caxton's History of the Destruction of Troy. But, in the ancients, there is no trace of the particular story of "Troilus and Creseide." It occurs, indeed in Lydgate and Caxton; but the character of Pandarus is entirely wanting, except a single mention of him by Lydgate, with an express reference to Chaucer as his authority. Our author's conclusion is therefore, we think, well-founded, when he says that "Shakespeare has taken the story of Chaucer with all its imperfections and defects, and has copied the series of its incidents with his customary fidelity." (p. 318.)

Our

Our author here inſtitutes a compariſon between the merits of Chaucer and of Shakeſpeare in the management of this ſtory; and he gives, upon the whole, the preference to Shakeſpeare. The grounds of his deciſion are generally juſt: but his criticiſm is, ſometimes, we think, equivocal. Chaucer's poem, he ſays, "is written in that ſtyle which has unfortunately been ſo long impoſed upon the world as dignified, claſſical, and chaſte" (p. 318.); and he afterwards obſerves that "one of the moſt formidable adverſaries of true poetry is an attribute which is generally miſcalled dignity." (p. 324.) Our author, we believe, intended to ſay that, in every poem of a dramatic nature, the ſtyle ſhould be carefully adapted to the different characters; which is certainly true: but he has not, we apprehend, expreſſed himſelf happily. It will not, we think, be readily granted that any ſtyle is the worſe for being "*dignified, claſſical, and chaſte.*" It ſhould, indeed, be natural, and vary with the ſpeaker, as well as with the ſubject; but no man of good taſte, we imagine, conſiders as excellencies the vulgariſms, quibbles, and indelicate double meanings of Shakeſpeare. Our author himſelf, indeed, allows that, in delicacy, Chaucer greatly ſurpaſſes Shakeſpeare. "In Chaucer Troilus is the pattern of an honourable lover, chooſing rather every extremity, and the loſs of life, than to divulge, whether in a direct or an indirect manner, any thing which might compromiſe the reputation of his miſtreſs, or lay open her name as a topic for the comments of the vulgar." The ſentence which follows reſpecting Creſeide, we copy with unmingled ſatisfaction, for a reaſon which our readers will readily conceive. "Creſeide, however (as Mr. Urry has obſerved,) ſhe proves at laſt a falſe unconſtant whore, yet in the commencement, and for a conſiderable time, preſerves *thoſe ingenuous manners, and that propriety of conduct, which are the brighteſt ornaments of the female character.*" (p. 325.) Even Pandarus, our author obſerves, is, in Chaucer, a friendly, kind-hearted man, who, rather than not contribute to the happineſs of the man whom he loves, is content to overlook the odium to which his proceedings are intitled. Shakeſpeare has depraved every one of theſe characters.

"His Troilus" ſays Mr. G., "ſhews no reluctance to render his *amour* a ſubject of notoriety to the whole city; his Creſſida, (for example in the ſcene with the Grecian chiefs, to all of whom ſhe is a total ſtranger,) aſſumes the manners of the moſt abandoned proſtitute; and his Pandarus enters upon his vile occupation, not from any venial partiality to the deſires of his friend, but from the direct and ſimple love of what is groſs, impudent, and profligate." (p. 326.)

Mr. G's ſeventeenth chapter contains ſuch memoirs as can be collected of Chaucer's two confidential friends, the "moral Gower" and the "philoſophical Strode," to whom the Troilus and Creſeide is inſcribed; of their hiſtory, however, little is with certainty known.

But Gower's *moral* character has been impeached, as deficient both in gratitude and in loyalty. His poem "De Confeſſione Amantis"

was

was undertaken, as he himſelf informs us, in compliance with the order of Richard II., who meeting the poet one day, on the river, commanded him to come into the royal barge and enjoined him to "boke ſome new thinge." On the depoſition of Richard by his couſin Henry IV., Gower, ſays Mr. Godwin in another place (Vol. II. p. 543.), "was one of the firſt to congratulate the new King upon his unexpected and ill-gotten dignity; and he thought [that] he could never ſufficiently exerciſe his talent in encomiums, upon this great event." On this conduct of Gower, the writer of Chaucer's life, prefixed to Urry's edition of his works, indignantly remarks, that

"The reſpect Chaucer retained for his former maſter Richard, and gratitude for the favours he had received from him, kept him from trampling upon his memory, and baſely flattering the new king, as moſt of his contemporaries did; and particularly Gower, who, notwithſtanding the obligations he had to Richard II., yet when old, blind, and paſt any hopes of honour or advantage, unleſs the view of keeping what he enjoyed, baſely inſulted the memory of his murdered maſter, and as ignominiouſly flattered his murderer."

It is obſerved, to the ſame purpoſe, by Mr. Tyrwhitt, that the chief variations which are to be found in the different copies of Gower's work, ariſe from this circumſtance, that "every thing which Gower had ſaid in praiſe of Richard in the firſt edition, is either left out, or converted to the uſe of his ſucceſſor, in the ſecond."

Such conduct certainly appears to us diſhonourable in the higheſt degree. Yet Mr. G. undertakes to vindicate Gower from the "unconſidered cenſures," as he calls them, which have been paſſed upon the poet on this account; and the vindication is, in our opinion, one of the weakeſt, as well as one of the moſt reprehenſible, parts of the book. He begins by obſerving that "few particulars in the Engliſh hiſtory are involved in greater obſcurity than the fluctuations of party during the reign of Richard. But the modern writers upon this topic" he adds, "ſpeak with as much peremptorineſs and confidence as if the merits of the caſe were completely before them." (p. 341.) Mr. G. however has, in this caſe at leaſt, followed their example. If theſe writers have ſuppoſed that Gower was under perſonal obligations to Richard, Mr. G. ſuppoſes, with no greater reaſon, that he was under none. The ſum of them, he thinks was confined to ſome flattering words, and a condeſcending injunction to "boke ſome newe thinge." The King's conduct, on this occaſion, "has much more," he ſays, "the air of a trick of ſtate, one of the artifices which men in high ſtation often ſo well underſtand, for cajoling their inferiors, and giving themſelves a ſhew of literature and patronage, than any real generoſity. The poet, however, took it all in ſerious part; and gravely ſet himſelf to compoſe an immenſe work, in eight books, and in more than 30,000 verſes. "What reward," aſks our author, "did Richard confer upon him for this unexampled ſtretch of obedience? *We do not know that he even condeſcended to read a ſingle verſe of the* 30,000 *which were thus laid at his feet.*"

The

The following is our author's concluding ſentence, which is certainly written "with as much peremptorineſs and confidence as if the merits of the caſe were completely before him." "Such was the vaſt weight of obligation which the poor poet was bound for ever to remember!" (p. 342.)

Of this vindication it is obvious to remark, that, beſide being built on gratuitous ſuppoſitions, for the truth of which there is not a particle of proof, it places the poet in a point of view which no man of common ſenſe will believe to be a juſt one. Gower was, at the time of this interview with the king, an old experienced courtier, not likely to be caught by a few ſugared words, or impoſed on by the cajoling artifices of a man who was not only much younger than himſelf, but who ſeems to have had little artifice about him. But, "perhaps," ſays Mr. G., "it was not exactly graceful to retract praiſes beſtowed upon his *nominal* patron, juſt at the period when his power to reward was no more." (p. 343.) NOT EXACTLY GRACEFUL! Is it thus that Mr. G. talks of the mercenary, time-ſerving, panegyriſt of a deteſtable uſurping traitor? But Mr. G. is willing to attribute the ſcandalous diſloyalty of Gower to his keen reſentment, and virtuous indignation, for the death of his patron, Thomas of Woodſtock, whom Mr. G. repreſents as having been *murdered* by Richard. "Nor can we," ſays our author, in another part of his work, (Vol. II. p. 543.) "ſeverely condemn his (Gower's) feelings or his conduct: he experienced *an awful joy* at ſeeing the *murder* of his great protector and patron ſo ſoon and ſignally avenged." But how does Mr. G. know that Woodſtock was murdered? When the king commanded the governor of Calais to bring him over to London for trial, the anſwer was, that he had died of an apoplexy. "But," ſays our author, "it was afterwards proved that he had, by the king's command, been forcibly ſmothered in his bed." (Vol. I. p. 344.) *Proved!* Yes it was, indeed, *proved*, in the firſt parliament of Richard's *murderer*. But Mr. G. is here rather backward to allow that Richard was murdered. "How King Richard periſhed is," he ſays, "a queſtion for ever wrapped up in the veil of obſcurity." (p. 345.) Yet he himſelf (Vol. II. p. 551.) records that Richard periſhed with hunger. "Either," he adds, "the ſuſpicious and unrelenting uſurper, irritated by the conſpiracy, (which had been entered into by Richard's friends for his reſcue) iſſued orders for the deſtruction of his rival by theſe cruel means, or, which is the report of the contemporary hiſtorians, and is ſufficiently co-incident with what we know of the diſpoſitions of the miſguided prince, hearing of this general maſſacre of his friends, he refuſed all nouriſhment, and voluntarily followed them to the tomb." If this laſt be the true account of Richard's death, his memory ought to be dear to every virtuous and affectionate heart. He doubtleſs had his faults: but ſuch a man we can never ſuppoſe to have been cruel; and therefore we cannot believe that he would murder his uncle, eſpecially when he was under no temptation to do ſo; when he had completely crushed the faction of that turbulent prince, and might, with equal juſtice

juſtice and ſafety, have delivered him over to the legal puniſhment of his repeated treaſons. But Henry was a cold-blooded, unfeeling tyrant, equally actuated by ambition and reſentment. He was certainly *capable* of murdering Richard: and, as principle did not ſtand in his way, he moſt probably did ſo. As to the pretended perſuaſion and deciſion of his profligate parliament, they muſt, on this occaſion, in the eye of every unbiaſſed mind, evidently go for nothing.

After this vindication, ſuch as it is, of the character of Gower, a vindication of which, whatever is not wholly gratuitous, is worſe, our ingenious biographer deſcends to ſome poor common-place lamentations on the capriciouſneſs of fame.

"It is thus that reputation, applauſe, and infamy, are diſtributed. We may fairly pronounce of Fame that ſhe is not leſs blind than Love. She ſcatters about her honours and her diſgrace with a profuſe and undiſtinguiſhing hand. She is often the mere echo of popular and fugitive calumnies, and often aggravates them with her own rancorous inventions. Particularly, men like our poet, who have proved themſelves the benefactors of mankind, frequently encounter the harſheſt treatment. *Men who have accumulated knowledge, and been the luminaries of their times, who have laboured for the delight and inſtruction of their ſpecies, and have recorded in imperiſhable works their benevolence, their affectionate nature, and their anxiety for the cauſe of morals and virtue, mankind ſeem to have a ſingular ſatisfaction in regarding, in their perſonal tranſactions, with a ſevere, faſtidious, and jaundiced eye.*" (Pp. 345, 346.)

With regard to theſe pathetic complaints, we ſhall ſimply obſerve that literary men, as well as other men, are ſufficiently prone to over-rate and exaggerate their own claims to praiſe. Many perſons, we ſuſpect, indeed, will be ready enough to put, in this place, a conſtruction on Mr. G's. language, which we do not ſuppoſe that he had in view. But the conduct of Gower, with regard to Richard, put an end to the friendſhip which had ſubſiſted between him and Chaucer for more than forty years. "Chaucer is conſtrued as throwing out an indirect ſarcaſm againſt Gower, in the prologue to his 'Man of Law's Tale;' and the compliment to Chaucer in the epilogue to Gower's 'De Confeſſione Amantis,' is ſuppreſſed in ſome manuſcripts of that work, being probably withdrawn by the hand of the author." (p. 346.)

The cauſe of this diſſolution of friendſhip is, in the higheſt degree, honourable to Chaucer, who evidently regarded the mean and diſloyal conduct of Gower with abhorrence and contempt. The uſurpation of Henry diſcloſed to the rightly formed mind of Chaucer, ſuch a want of virtue in his former friend, that he was determined to have no farther connection with him. The characters of the two poets, and their conduct on this occaſion, are ſo well contraſted by Mr. Godwin, that we cannot do better than give the outlines of the contraſt.

"Chaucer preſerved the moſt inviolable ſilence. Not one line has he dedicated to this revolution; not in one paſſage of his works, is there any mention of Henry of Bolingbroke. Chaucer had many motives which Gower had not to pay his devotions to *the new lord of the aſcendant* [an affected

fected phraſe]. Henry IV. was the ſon of the man to whom he had been unreſervedly attached through life, and who had never ceaſed to feed him with benefits. We may believe, from the multitude of verſes in which Gower has celebrated the uſurper, that Henry was ambitious of the ſuffrage of the muſes. Nor was the king inattentive to the poet of his family. Theſe things conſidered, the contraſt between the behaviour of Chaucer and Gower, on this memorable occaſion, cannot fail to appear ſtriking. Chaucer, we have a right to believe, as a patriot, anticipated the conſequence of the uſurpation with terror. He felt that it would be unworthy [of] the reſpect [which] he entertained for John of Gaunt, one of whoſe moſt cherished principles was loyalty, and who, he was ſure, would, if yet living, have been among the bittereſt cenſurers of the conduct of his ſon, to join the crowd of adulators drawn together by the attraction of a ſplendid crime. He diſdained to proſtitute himſelf to the applauſe of a bold and dazzling act, pregnant with the direſt calamities to his country." (Vol. II. pp. 543—545.)

We ſhall, perhaps, be thought to have dwelt already too long on this incident, although it is certainly both intereſting and important. Yet we cannot quit the ſubject without laying before our readers the pathetic wailings of our tender-hearted author, on the breach which took place between Chaucer and Gower. They are as follows:

"Whether Gower were intoxicated with receiving the royal command to 'boke ſome newe thinge,' and afterwards ſaw the folly of yielding in this point to the whiſpers of vanity; whether he ſympathized with the ambition and daring views of Thomas of Woodſtock, or looked on with ſome degree of indifference at his tragical fate, are points comparatively of ſmall importance to the obſerver of imagination and feeling.

'Princes and Lords may flouriſh, or may fade;
A breath can make them as a breath has made:'

but that two men like Gower and Chaucer, with ſo many points of ſympathy, with ſo great a ſimilarity of purſuits, both lovers of learning, both inſpired with taſte, both cultivators and refiners of their native tongue, at a time when ſo few minds exiſted congenial with their own,—that two ſuch men, after having known each other ſo intimately, and mutually looked to each other for fellowſhip in amuſement, and relief in adverſity, during ſo long a period, ſhould afterward come to view each other with eyes of eſtrangement, indifference, and diſtaſte,—forcibly impreſſes us with a ſort of deſpondence, with a feeling (not merely hoſtile to the empty and frivolous deluſions of ambition; but) as if refinement was nothing, as if faculties were nothing, as if virtue was nothing, as if all that was ſweeteſt, and all that was higheſt in human nature, was an idle ſhow, was pure vanity and vexation of ſpirit." (Vol. I. p. 346, 347.)

If in theſe effuſions our ingenious author had not exhibited the moſt indubitable ſigns of wiſhing to be conſidered as in earneſt, we ſhould certainly have regarded the whole paragraph as ironical: for this is the very caricature of philanthropy. What were Chaucer and Gower, that they ſhould thus be exalted above kings and nations, and their differences repreſented as ſufficient to diſguſt men with virtue,

and with life; as ſufficient to create a blank in the univerſe? But we can ſolemnly aſſure our ingenious author that theſe differences have produced in our minds very oppoſite feelings; for we think that, though undoubtedly in contemplating this termination of a long and intimate friendſhip, there is room for lamentation, he has altogether overlooked the circumſtance which is really to be lamented. It is unqueſtionably a ſubject of ſerious lamentation, that ſo many men ſhould be found like Gower, who, while they are eminently diſtinguiſhed by *literary*, are totally devoid of *moral*, taſte, and who, while they rank high on account of their talents, deſerve to be execrated for want of principle. But if, in the contemplation of ſuch characters, we are apt to be diſguſted with the world, we are happily again conſoled and cheared by turning our thoughts to men of ſterling and dignified worth like Chaucer; whoſe behaviour, on this occaſion, has ſurrounded his name with a glory ſuperior to what learning or genius can beſtow, and which, as long as moral excellence ſhall be had in eſteem, can never fade. Chaucer did what every good man does in the ſame ſituation. He reluctantly renounced his former friend when he found him deſtitute of thoſe valuable qualities which are the only baſis of love and eſteem; when he found in him neither public nor private virtue; when he found him the cringing, mercenary, unprincipled, advocate and flatterer of treaſon, uſurpation, and murder.

In the concluſion of this XVIIth chapter, Mr. G. has, ſeemingly, well appreciated the literary character of Gower, which, though certainly not equal to that of Chaucer, yet, in juſtice, ought to be rated high.

(To be continued.)

Remarks on the Controverſy ſubſiſting, or ſuppoſed to ſubſiſt, between the Arminian and Calviniſtic Miniſters of the Church of England: in a ſecond Letter to the Rev. John Overton, A. B., Author of "The True Churchmen aſcertained." By Edward Pearſon, B.D., Rector of Rempſtone, Nottinghamſhire. 8vo. Pp. 102. Hatchard. 1802.

THIS ſecond letter of Mr. Pearſon to Mr. Overton is of a more general nature than the firſt, and contains a variety of important obſervations relating both to doctrine and to diſcipline. The author begins by expreſſing his ſtrong diſapprobation of the *title* of "Evangelical Miniſters," by which the "upſtart ſect" of "True Churchmen" chooſe to be diſtinguiſhed. "If, as you aſſert," he ſays, "it is the title under which you have been attacked, it is pretty evident that it muſt have been firſt aſſumed; and the aſſumption of a title, which, by arrogating ſo much to yourſelves, was directly calculated to derogate from the juſt claims of others, was ſufficient to provoke an attack." (p. 6.) That it was aſſumed we have not a doubt; and there

there is, to make uſe of Mr. Overton's language, "a ſeeming affectation" in the manner in which he apologizes for it. "It is that under which, among others, they are accuſed, and which, in reality, *is in ſome degree, characteriſtic of them.*" But, as the only or chief difference between them and their opponents conſiſts in the former's annexing a Calviniſtic, while the latter annex an Arminian, ſenſe to certain of the articles; Mr. Pearſon contends that the terms Arminian and Calviniſtic are ſufficient, as well as appropriate, terms of diſtinction. "Beſides," ſays he, "every term by which a party is diſtinguiſhed, ſuppoſes another, by which the party in oppoſition to it is to be known. Now, if one claſs of miniſters of the Eſtabliſhment is to be diſtinguiſhed by the term *Evangelical* or *Goſpel*, by what name, which does not imply diſgrace, ſhall the reſt be called?" (p. 8.) How could this learned and ingenious writer be ſo ſimple as ſeriouſly to put ſuch a queſtion? Is it not the purpoſe, open and avowed, of Mr. Overton's book, and the conſtant endeavour of the whole party, to affix diſgrace on the general body of the National Clergy, who, they not only inſinuate, but expreſsly aſſert, *do not preach the Goſpel?* The wiſh is, therefore, vain which Mr. Pearſon entertains that the term *Evangelical* ſhould be laid aſide. The "True Churchmen" would as ſoon relinquiſh their livings as ſuch a flattering appellation. It ſerves two grand important purpoſes, both of which they have greatly at heart. It conſecrates themſelves as ſaints in the eyes of the ignorant unſtable multitude; and it places the reſt of the Clergy in a view the beſt calculated to deprive them of all eſteem or reverence from the people. In both lights it cannot fail to ſtrike us as an admirable expedient for promoting the favourite cauſe of Calviniſm, of which the wild impieties are thus diſguiſed under the venerable name of the Goſpel of Chriſt.

But the queſtion in debate between Mr. Overton and his opponents is the comparative *merit* of an Arminian and a Calviniſtic interpretation of ſome of the articles of the Church of England. Mr. Overton, indeed, has avoided the defence of thoſe tenets of Calviniſm which, of late years, have become peculiarly unpopular; and Mr. Pearſon is inclined to give him credit for having fairly and fully developed his creed. We ſhould be ſorry to have many differences with Mr. Pearſon; but, whatever impeachment it may be of our candour, we cannot, on the preſent occaſion, agree with him. We are firmly convinced, and we think, we have proved, that Mr. Overton has *not* fairly and fully developed his creed. What the amiable Biſhop of Rocheſter has ſaid * of "experiences, ſenſible impreſſions, and immediate illuminations," might be juſtly converted into a general poſition, or, at leaſt, is applicable to many other parts of "The True Churchmen aſcertained," beſide thoſe parts in which theſe ſubjects are diſcuſſed. "I cannot," ſays his Lordſhip, "but obſerve upon the cautious and ſtudied obſcu-

* See ANTI-JACOBIN REVIEW, Vol. XVI. Pp. 424.

rity under which an apologiſt of theirs (the true Churchmen) has thought fit, among other reſerves, to veil this leading feature of the ſyſtem. After the moſt accurate, and I will ſay the moſt candid, attention which I have been able to beſtow on this part of his work, I have always left it with an impreſſion that much was diſguiſed and untold; and I never could bring the profeſſions which I met with into any agreement with the practice which I know to be founded upon them." But, on the part of many of Mr. Overton's friends, our author would be glad to have it formally acknowledged, that their champion has defended *all* the opinions by which they wiſh to be diſtinguiſhed. This acknowledgment, however, we venture to aſſure him, he never will obtain. He would be glad to know, particularly, whether they are willing and ready to give up thoſe peculiar notions reſpecting *immediate converſion*, *perſeverance of the ſaints*, *aſſurance of ſalvation*, &c. which the majority of Calviniſtic miniſters are underſtood to entertain. We ſhall likewiſe venture to aſſure our author that they are not ready to give theſe notions up; that they never will give them up; and farther, that ſo long as they adhere to Calviniſm they never can, with conſiſtency, give up the ſecond and third of the above-mentioned points, becauſe they are eſſential parts of the ſyſtem.

Mr. Pearſon has tranſcribed, from Moſheim, the famous FIVE ARTICLES or POINTS, as they are called, by which the Arminians were originally diſtinguiſhed. Theſe we do not judge it neceſſary to inſert, as they are, we believe, ſufficiently known; but we cannot omit the following reflection, with which our own ſentiments entirely coincide. "When," ſays Mr. Pearſon, "I read theſe articles, I can conſider it as little leſs than a libel on the goſpel to diſtinguiſh thoſe by the appellation of *Evangelical*, who, in oppoſition to ſuch generous ſentiments, repreſent the gifts of eternal life as circumſcribed by *abſolute decrees*, and the *withholding of neceſſary grace*, and who, by their mode of defending theſe and the like doctrines, ſeem to take delight 'in ſhutting the gates of mercy on mankind." (pp. 13, 14.) For full information on the ſubject of theſe articles, Mr. Pearſon refers the reader to Heylin's "Hiſtoria Quinquarticularis," Whitby's "Diſcourſes on the Five Points," Wincheſter's Tract on the XVIIth Article of the Church of England, Tucker's "Letter to Kippis," and the firſt volume of Daubeny's appendix. Of Whitby Dr. Jortin has ſaid that, "in his Treatiſe on Election, Reprobation, and Original Sin, he confuted Calviniſm even to a demonſtration."

"But," ſays our fair and ingenuous remarker, "it is my wiſh that the queſtion ſhould be determined, not by the weight of authority, but by the preponderance of the arguments, which have been, or may be, advanced. I am perſuaded, that the more the ſubject is inveſtigated, the more it will be for the advantage of Arminianiſm; and that, if Calviniſm ſhould gain ground in the nation, it will be principally owing to that inattention to religious concerns which ſo much prevails among the laity of the preſent day; eſpecially among thoſe of them who, on account of their intelligence on other ſubjects, are looked up to and followed as exemplars." (pp. 16, 17.).

"Thoſe who argue," continues our author, "in favour of Calviniſm, have

have a great many objections to get over, which may be urged from reaſon and ſcripture with reſpect to its *truth*, as well as from experience with reſpect to its *utility*. If, indeed, it be not *true*, it will hardly be expected to be *useful in the end*: but, whether true or not, its hoſtility, in many reſpects, to public peace and happineſs, particularly in a form of government like ours, is matter of ſad experience. It is no juſt reaſon for blaming thoſe who hold any particular opinions, that others, who held the ſame opinions, acted wrong; but it is a very good reaſon for keeping a jealous eye upon the opinions themſelves. It ought ever to be remembered, with reſpect to Calviniſtic opinions, though without any uncharitable ſentiments towards thoſe who may now hold them, that, ſo far as religious opinions were at all concerned, *they* were the opinions which once involved our Church and State in ruin. The ſagacious author of the 'Purſuits of Literature,' aſſerts that 'Calvin and his diſciples were never friends to Monarchy and Epiſcopacy;' and few will be ſo hardy as to deny that the hiſtory of our nation bears him out in his aſſertion." (pp. 17, 18.)

But neither the truth nor utility of Calviniſm is properly the ſubject of Mr. Overton's work. His object is to ſhew that Calviniſm is the doctrine of the Church of England. Mr. Pearſon's opinion is probably right, that ſome of our Reformers were inclined to Calviniſm, and others to what has ſince been called Arminianiſm. And hence, as he obſerves, "To the Church of England is 'ſua opinio, ſuus honor. Properly ſpeaking, ſhe is not, in her doctrines, any more than in her diſcipline, Calviniſtic, Arminian, Romiſh, or Lutheran; but, combining the perfections of all thoſe perſuaſions, and avoiding their faults and defects, ſhe ſtands as diſtinguiſhed in a religious view, as the ſtate to which ſhe is allied, does in a political one." (pp. 19, 20.) Though, therefore, it is natural enough, from the private opinions of individual reformers, to form conjectures concerning the doctrines which ſuch individuals muſt have wiſhed to eſtabliſh, yet vain muſt, evidently, be the attempt, by ſuch a mode of reaſoning, *to aſcertain*, as Mr. Overton pretends to do, the ſtandard doctrines of the Church. Theſe can no otherwiſe be aſcertained than by a fair examination and compariſon of the authorized inſtruments in which they are contained. This mode of inquiry Mr. Pearſon has purſued, as we have already ſeen, with regard to the meaning of the XIth Article; and we certainly think that he is well entitled to make the following declaration:

"I greatly deceive myſelf, if I have not incontrovertibly ſhewn that the Calviniſtic interpretation, which you have given of that article, in endeavouring to eſtabliſh on it the doctrine of juſtification and ſalvation by *faith only*, when faith is conſidered as the *condition* of either, is not the true ſenſe of it, is not the ſenſe which the words will fairly bear, nor that, conſequently, in which the Church of England does, or ever did, intend it to be underſtood." (p. 21.)

But, ſuppoſing that the private ſentiments of the Reformers were a proper criterion by which to determine the ſenſe of the articles, Mr. Overton's evidence is incompetent to ſhew what theſe ſentiments

were. On the teſtimony of perſons profeſſedly hoſtile to our religious eſtabliſhment, it is evident that little ſtreſs can be laid: and though Mr. Overton has frequently appealed to thoſe who were undoubted friends to the eſtabliſhment, he has generally miſquoted, or miſrepreſented them. This our author ſhews to be eminently the caſe with regard to Hooker, whom, on the doctrine of juſtification by faith, Mr. Overton very cooly holds up as a decided Calviniſt. Yet Hooker's ſentiments on that ſubject are evidently the ſame with thoſe which Mr. Pearſon and we maintain. Thus, in his 'Diſcourſe on Juſtification,' we find the following paſſages, which it is impoſſible to miſunderſtand: "To ſay ye cannot be ſaved by Chriſt without works, is to add things not only not excluded but commanded, as being in their place and in their kind neceſſary, and therefore ſubordinated unto Chriſt, by Chriſt himſelf, by whom the web of ſalvation is ſpun." Again, "We ourſelves do not teach Chriſt alone, excluding our own faith unto juſtification; Chriſt alone, excluding our own works unto ſanctification; Chriſt alone, excluding the one or the other, as unneceſſary unto ſalvation." The ſame judicious and ſound divine, when ſpeaking more particularly of the conditions of the *firſt* juſtification, ſays: "Although in ourſelves we be altogether ſinful and unrighteous, yet even the man which is impious in himſelf, full of iniquity, full of ſin, him being found in Chriſt *through faith*, and having his ſin remitted *through repentance*; him God upholdeth with a gracious eye, putteth away his ſin by not imputing it, &c." It was a bold attempt of Mr. Overton to repreſent the Arminian Hooker as holding the opinions of his profeſſed antagoniſt, the Calviniſtic Travers. But by what means does he accompliſh this? By mutilating, with his accuſtomed good faith, the language of Hooker, and omitting the very eſſential words, "and having his ſins remitted through repentance;" which, eſpecially when taken in connection with the other paſſages here quoted, are ſufficiently deciſive of Hooker's ſentiments. For he evidently held that of the *firſt juſtification*, the conditions are *repentance and faith*; of the *final juſtification*, or *ſalvation*, faith and *good works*.

Mr. Overton, however, with a view, as it ſhould ſeem, to diſcredit this diſtinction between a *firſt* and a *final* juſtification, has, in a note p. 181, introduced a paſſage from Hooker, as if it applied to this diſtinction, while it really applies to the Romiſh doctrine of juſtification by inherent grace, and to the practice of ſeeking to be juſtified by "Ave Marias, croſſings, Papal ſalutations, maſſes, pilgrimages, faſts, &c." But Hooker has virtually acknowledged the diſtinction of juſtification into *firſt* and *final*. For ſpeaking of the poſſibility of ſalvation to thoſe who had lived in Popiſh errors, he ſays, "Did they hold that without works we are not juſtified? Take juſtification ſo as it may alſo imply ſanctification, and St. James doth ſay as much. For, except there be an ambiguity in the ſame term (juſtification) St. Paul and St. James do contradict each the other, which cannot be. Finding, therefore, that juſtification is ſpoken of by St. Paul, without implying

implying ſanctification, when he proveth that a man is juſtified by faith without works; finding, likewiſe, that juſtification doth ſometimes imply ſanctification alſo with it, I ſuppoſe nothing to be more found than to interpret St. James ſpeaking, not in that ſenſe, but in this." This is really ſaying that St. Paul is ſpeaking of the firſt juſtification, or of entering into a ſtate of ſalvation; and that St. James is ſpeaking of the laſt juſtification, or of continuing in a ſtate of ſalvation, and being finally ſaved. Yet Mr. Overton's coadjutors, the editors of the Chriſtian Obſerver, who tell the public, "We have compared his (Mr. Overton's) authorities with the originals, and examined them with a view to eſtimate the doctrines inculcated in the context," can deliberately aſſert, with regard to the ſubject of the above-mentioned note, "Mr. Overton ſupports his ſentiments by a deciſive extract from Hooker." "With the licence," ſays our author, "which Mr. O. has uſed on this occaſion, I would undertake to make Hooker, or any other author, ſupport any ſentiment whatever." (Pp. 21—30.)

We are inclined, with Mr. Pearſon, to believe that, had the Calviniſtic miniſters of the eſtabliſhment been content to enjoy their opinions in quiet, without ſtigmatizing thoſe of their opponents as contrary both to the doctrines of the church, and to the truth of the goſpel, they had never experienced any moleſtation. But "the followers of Calvin," as he juſtly obſerves, "like their leader, have always had a ſtrong diſpoſition to intolerance, and they ſtill retain it. In the true ſpirit of Procruſtes, they would exclude every one from communion with them, whoſe opinions no not exactly coincide with their own." Nothing leſs will ſatisfy them, than a full acknowledgement that they alone are the genuine ſons of the Church of England. "*We*, then," exclaims Mr. Overton, "are the TRUE CHURCHMEN; and Mr. Daubeny and his aſſociates are DISSENTERS from the Church of England." How ſuch a claim is to be reconciled with the ſecond title of Mr. Overton's book, "An Apology" or defence, Mr. Pearſon ſays that he does not perceive. He thinks that, even in a *prudential* view, ſuch a claim was injudicious; and, undoubtedly it is calculated to provoke a ſtrict and minute inquiry into the grounds on which it reſts. The Calviniſtic interpretation of the articles, he maintains, has never received the ſanction of authority, *declared* or *implied*. Mr. O. has ſaid much about the royal declaration prefixed to the articles; but not one word about its real object, which was to make peace between the Calviniſts and Arminians at the time of its publication. He has drawn from it, however, a concluſion, which, as our author and Mr. Daubeny obſerve, is directly contrary to what he ought to have drawn. "If," ſays Mr. Pearſon, "as you ſay, and as is undoubtedly true, this declaration was obtained by the influence of Biſhop Laud and his aſſociates, as 'expreſſive of the doctrines *then* taught in the Church,' nothing is more certain than it is expreſſive of Arminianiſm, and that Arminianiſm was then taught

in the Church: for nothing is more certain than that Biſhop Laud and his aſſociates were Arminians." (p. 37.)

Mr. Pearſon adverts to the teſtimony of Moſheim, who ſays that "Laud rejected the Calviniſtic doctrine of predeſtination publicly in the year 1625, and, notwithſtanding the oppoſition and remonſtrances of Abbot, ſubſtituted the Arminian ſyſtem in its place." The hiſtorian, he obſerves, ſeems here to ſpeak of the prevalence of Arminianiſm as new. Yet nothing is more certain than that, long before this time, the great body of the Engliſh clergy were Arminians. Accordingly Moſheim himſelf has told us that the Britiſh divines were ſcarcely returned from the Synod of Dort, when the king and clergy diſcovered, in the ſtrongeſt terms, their diſlike of its proceedings. This was about the year 1618, only 56 years after the 39 Articles were finally ſettled. Even ſo early as 1603, the tendency of the Engliſh clergy to Arminianiſm was clearly diſcovered at the Hampton Court conference.

"How theſe facts," ſays our author, "are to be brought to an agreement with your aſſertion, page 83, that 'there were but *four* or *five* maintainers of the Anti-Calviniſtic doctrines, during *half a century* after the articles were ſettled, in the two Univerſities, and the whole aggregate of divines in the nation,' I do not clearly ſee. But leaving this, is it at all credible that Laud, an Arminian, and when the greateſt part of the Epiſcopal clergy were Arminians alſo, ſhould be induſtrious to obtain a *declaration*, by which a Calviniſtic interpretation of the articles was to be ſanctioned by authority." (Pp. 39, 40.)

The fact is that, as Collier informs us, "The Calvinian party complained loudly of this declaration. They gave out," ſays he, "that the deſign of it was chiefly for the ſuppreſſing orthodox books, for the diſcouraging godly miniſters from preaching the comfortable doctrines of man's election to eternal happineſs, and for promoting the growth of Arminianiſm." If, therefore, of the two, Arminianiſm and Calviniſm, the declaration was intended to countenance the one more than the other, that one was clearly underſtood at the time to be Arminianiſm.

It is known that, about the end of Elizabeth's reign, and the beginning of the reign of James I. the *puritans*, who always agreed with *Epiſcopal* Calviniſts in *doctrine*, however they might differ from them in *diſcipline*, were not ſatisfied with the articles themſelves. This appears from the hiſtory of the Lambeth Articles, and of the conference of Hampton Court. At that conference it was propoſed by the puritans that, in the XVIth Article, to the words "we may depart from grace given" ſhould be added "yet neither totally nor finally." This attempt was meant to eſtabliſh the doctrine of the *perſeverance of the ſaints*; a doctrine of which the tendency may be learned from the following anecdote, given us by Dr Hey from Neil. "When Oliver Cromwell was on his death-bed, he aſked Dr. Goodwin *whether a man could fall from grace?* to which the doctor anſwering in the negative, the protector replied, *Then I am ſafe*;

ſafe; for I am ſure I was once in a ſtate of grace." (Hey's Lectures, Vol. III. p. 447.) Another propoſal of the puritans was that the Lambeth Articles ſhould be conſidered as part of the Articles of the Church of England; and, in the conference at the Savoy, on the reſtoration, there was an evident deſire on the part of the Calviniſts of obtaining a change, if not in the Articles, at leaſt in the *liturgy* and *ſervice* of the Church. Whether Calviniſts of the preſent day, who are profeſſed members of the Church of England, would, if they had the power, effect an alteration of the Articles themſelves, Mr. Pearſon will not venture poſitively to affirm. *We* are clearly of opinion that they would. But we agree with him that, without inſulting the royal declaration, the validity and obligation of which they ſo ſtrenuouſly urge, they cannot affirm that the Articles are excluſively Calviniſtic.

As we have reaſon to believe that the Lambeth Articles, though frequently mentioned, are not generally known, we ſhall gratify many, we ſuppoſe, of our readers, by inſerting a copy of them. They may be found in Fuller's Church Hiſtory, and in Collier. They were originally in Latin; but the following tranſlation of them, which Mr. Pearſon thinks accurate, is taken from "*A Review of the Doctrines of the Reformers*, by Thomas Bowman, M. A., Vicar of Marſham, Norfolk."

"1. God from eternity hath predeſtinated certain men unto life, certain men he hath reprobated."

"2. The moving or efficient cauſe of predeſtination unto life, is not the foreſight of faith, or of perſeverance, or of good works, or of any thing that is in the perſon predeſtinated, but only the good will and pleaſure of God."

"3. There is predetermined a certain number of the predeſtinate, which can neither be augmented nor diminiſhed."

"4. Thoſe, who are not predeſtinated to ſalvation, ſhall be neceſſarily damned for their ſins."

"5. A true, living, and juſtifying faith, and the ſpirit of God juſtifying, is not extinguiſhed, falleth not away, it vaniſheth not away in the elect, either finally or totally."

"6. A man truly faithful, that is, ſuch an one, who is endued with a juſtifying faith, is certain, with the full of aſſurance of faith, of the remiſſion of his ſins, and of his everlaſting ſalvation by Chriſt."

"7. Saving grace is not given, is not granted, is not communicated to all men, by which they may be ſaved if they will."

"8. No man can come unto Chriſt unleſs it ſhall be given unto him, and unleſs the Father ſhall draw him; and all men are not drawn by the Father, that they may come to the Son."

"9. It is not in the will or power of every one to be ſaved."

No circumſtance, in Queen Elizabeth's conduct, has impreſſed us with a more favourable opinion of the ſoundneſs of her underſtanding, than her ordering, with indignation, and under pain of her high diſpleaſure, theſe abominable Articles to be inſtantly ſuppreſſed. Yet

theſe

theſe are the Articles ſo highly valued by a certain "preſbyter of the Church of England," that nothing, he thinks, can reflect ſuch diſhonour on a biſhop of that church as the ſuppoſition that, had his lordſhip been then at Lambeth, he muſt have marked them with abhorrence *. Our author's obſervations are here ſo excellent that we muſt tranſcribe them.

"It appears to me that this expoſition of what Calviniſm really is, muſt, in the mind of every one who is able either to read the *ſcriptures*, or to diſcover any thing of the character of the Supreme Being from the contemplation of his works, be a ſufficient refutation of it, and that no arguments need be employed for that purpoſe. It is not, however, to be denied that, from the force of early prejudice, or ſome other cauſe, many ſenſible and well-informed perſons have been Calviniſts to the full extent of theſe articles. Mr. Bowman, who ſeems to have been a perſon of this deſcription, has given a copy of the five Arminian articles, as well as of theſe Calviniſtic ones, and thus, whether prudently or not, has held out an invitation to a compariſon of the two; nor has he, indeed, made any ſcruple of declaring to which of them he gave the preference. Were I, Sir, to repreſent you and your friends as deſirous, if not of having the Lambeth articles incorporated into the articles of the Church of England, yet of having them conſidered as a fair comment on the preſent ones, I ſhould not do ſo on a mere conjecture. It is well known that, in the reign of James I., by the management of Archbiſhop Uſher (then provoſt of Dublin College.) who was a Calviniſt, the Lambeth articles, which had been ſuppreſſed by the command of Queen Elizabeth, and rejected at the Hampton Court conference, were incorporated into the articles of the Church of Ireland. Now, in Mr. Bowman's work, of which, with reſpect to its object, and the general tenor of the arguments employed to enforce it, yours may not improperly be conſidered as a re-publication, theſe Iriſh articles are recognized as 'ſpeaking the ſenſe of the Church of England, and, in particular, as well illuſtrating and explaining our ſeventeenth article on predeſtination.' In the courſe of the ſame work, Mr. Bowman reminds us that 'an archbiſhop (Laud) was brought to the bar, condemned, and executed, among other things, for introducing Arminianiſm.' This obſervation proves, if it prove any thing, that Calviniſm prevailed among thoſe who had the management of affairs at the period of that prelate's fall; of which, indeed, no one can entertain a doubt. This circumſtance, however, will not be admitted as very favourable to the cauſe of Calviniſm, when it is conſidered that the ſame perſons ſoon afterwards brought Charles I. to the block, among other things, for not agreeing to aboliſh *Epiſcopacy* and the uſe of a *liturgy*. (Collier, Vol. II. p. 858.) It is but juſt to add, with reſpect to Archbiſhop Uſher, (what Mr. Overton takes care to conceal) that he afterwards renounced his Calviniſtic opinions. 'Sometime before his death,' ſays Collier, (Vol. II. p. 868.) 'he changed his opinion touching the *five points*, came over to the other ſide, and was reconciled to Biſhop Overall's ſentiment.' That this is matter of fact, appears from the ſigned teſtimonies of Dr. Bryan Walton, Mr. Peter Gunning, and Mr. Herbert Thorndike.' It is proper to add

* See ANTI-JACOBIN REVIEW, Vol. XVI. Pp. 40.

alſo

alſo that, in 1634, the Articles of the Church of England were received as thoſe of the Church of Ireland. See Collier, Vol. II. p. 763." (Pp. 54—57.)

On the ſubject of diſcipline the remarks of this ſound and well-inſtructed churchman are moſt impreſſive and moſt important, but we are under the neceſſity of reporting them very briefly. He obſerves, that many profeſſed members of the Church ſeem hardly to conceive themſelves under any obligation to obſerve her diſcipline; and to this diſregard of order he thinks that Calviniſtic preaching, in which, generally ſpeaking, doctrine is every thing, and diſcipline nothing, has greatly contributed. Yet even *lay men* are under a *tacit promiſe* to obey the diſcipline of the Church; at leaſt, from the poſitive injunctions of Scripture, to "obey thoſe who have the rule over us, and who watch for our ſouls," they are under a *poſitive obligation* to obey it. With regard to *clergymen*, the caſe is ſtill more evident. They have expreſsly promiſed ſuch obedience. It would, perhaps, be unjuſt to ſay, that all Calviniſts are hoſtile to our eſtabliſhed form of Church government; but that Calviniſm itſelf is ſo, the Hiſtory of England, and ſtill more that of Scotland, abundantly prove. "Had it not been for the Arminianiſm of England, there would be now, throughout the united kingdom, no other than *titular* biſhops." (p. 63.) The ſpirit of Calviniſm has always been unfriendly to the uſe of a *preſcribed form of prayer*; with which Epiſcopacy ſeems ſo intimately connected that they will generally be found to riſe and fall together. To this diſinclination to a *form of prayer*, the peculiar pretenſions of Calviniſts to *inſpiration*, and their ſo far believing in the ſenſible operations of the holy ſpirit as to think that he ſuggeſts both the matter and manner of their public prayers, naturally lead. Accordingly in the celebrated conference at the Savoy, even the Calviniſts who profeſſed themſelves friends to Epiſcopacy and a liturgy gave in the following propoſal: "That *the gift of prayer* being one ſpecial qualification for the miniſtry, they deſire the liturgy may not be ſo ſtrictly impoſed as totally to exclude the exerciſe of that faculty in any part of public worſhip: and that, in conſequence of this, it may be left to the diſcretion of the miniſter to omit part of the ſtated ſervice, as occaſion ſhall require." To this curious propoſal, which would have rendered the appointment of a liturgy nugatory, the commiſſioners for the Church, conſiſting of divines as eminent as any of whom ſhe could ever boaſt, made the following admirable reply.

"Their propoſal touching *the gift of prayer* makes the liturgy, in effect, wholly inſignificant. For what elſe can be the conſequence, if every miniſter may put in and leave out at diſcretion? As for the *gift*, or rather the *ſpirit* of prayer, it conſiſts in the inward graces of the holy ſpirit, and not in extemporary expreſſions. Such unpremeditated effuſions are only the effects of natural parts, of a voluble tongue, and of uncommon aſſurance. But, if there is any ſuch gift as is really pretended, this extraordinary qualification muſt be ſubject to the prophets, and the order of the Church. Conſidering the miſchiefs coming by impertinent, ridiculous, and ſometimes ſeditious, wicked,

wicked, and blaſphemous expreſſions, under pretence of giving liberty for exerciſing *the gift of prayer*; conſidering the honour of God is ſo highly injured, and religion ſuffers ſo much in this way; it is reaſonable thoſe, who deſire ſuch an indulgence in public devotions, ſhould firſt give the Church ſecurity that no private opinions ſhould be put into their prayers; and that nothing contrary to *the faith* ſhould be uttered before God, or offered up to him in the Church. To prevent which miſchiefs, the former ages knew no better way than forbidding the uſe of any prayers in public, excepting ſuch as were preſcribed by public authority." (Collier, Vol. II. Pp. 878, 881.)

Mr. Pearſon ſays that he is much miſtaken if many Calviniſtic miniſters of the eſtabliſhment do not now wiſh for the liberty which was openly pleaded for at the Reſtoration; and, what is worſe, if ſome of them do not exerciſe it. There are, he is told, (and *we* KNOW the fact to be ſo,) Calviniſtic miniſters of the eſtabliſhment, who indulge in the uſe of extemporary prayer, in a way which is altogether inconſiſtent with obedience to the diſcipline of the Church. But, ſetting aſide the guilt of diſobedience, we are decidedly of our author's opinion that, though extemporary prayer in public may, by its novelty, and ſometimes, no doubt, by its extravagance, more gratify curioſity and pleaſe the fancy than a ſet form, it is by no means ſo well fitted to anſwer the purpoſes of devotion. To ſay the truth it is only (and even that not always) the prayer of the miniſter, and never of the congregation. But, be the reaſon of the thing as it may, it is evidently the deſign of our Church to prohibit, in public, the practice of extemporary prayer. Thoſe miniſters, therefore, of the eſtabliſhment who practice it, whether in *addition* to the Liturgy or otherwiſe, are guilty of a flagrant breach of diſcipline; and they farther give great occaſion to ſuſpect that their ſubmiſſion to the uſe of a Liturgy at all does not proceed from their conviction of its utility, but merely from its being preſcribed by an authority which they dare not entirely diſregard.

Many Calviniſts, Mr. Pearſon obſerves, profeſs a great regard for diſcipline; and he read, he ſays, with peculiar ſatisfaction, the following paſſage in Mr. Overton's work:

"The great body of theſe divines," the *evangelical*, "as ſincerely lament the *ſchism* of Dr. Haweis, as the *heterodoxy* of ſome other Doctors" But, "without inquiring," he adds, "into the particular inſtances, in which Dr. Haweis has ſhewn himſelf ſchiſmatical, I take the liberty of obſerving that there are many methods beſides that of open ſchiſm, by which the attachment of the people to the eſtabliſhed diſcipline may be weakened, and ſchiſm encouraged; and I cannot but wiſh that you had been as particular in telling us what, according to your idea, is a breach of diſcipline, as you have been in telling us what *is not*. A friend of mine once obſerved to me that 'the preaching, which is called *evangelical*, may be conſidered as a *half way houſe* between the church and the conventicle.' How far this obſervation is well-founded, I ſhall not undertake poſitively to determine; but if, in the preaching of Calviniſtic miniſters, ſo great a ſtreſs is laid on doctrines, and particularly on thoſe doctrines by which Calviniſm is diſtinguiſhed from Arminianiſm,

Arminianiſm, as to make diſcipline appear of but little comparative importance, and, (to uſe your own expreſſion) like 'the chaff to the wheat,' it is eaſy to ſee that a way is gradually opened for a ſeparation from the Church." (Pp. 71—73.)

Nothing is more common among the lower ſort of people, than for perſons to deſert their own pariſh church to attend on ſome neighbouring miniſter, whoſe preaching has got the character of being more *evangelical*. Though Mr. Pearſon does not, in general, approve of ſuch conduct, yet circumſtances, he ſays, may occur in which it would be ſtrictly defenſible. We have always regarded ſuch conduct as ſchiſmatical; and we wiſh that our learned and candid author had pointed out the particular circumſtances which, in his opinion, juſtify it: for his conceſſion, ſtanding, as it now does, without any ſpecified limitations, may eaſily, we conceive, be made a bad uſe of. The evil, however, does not terminate here. Thoſe who have been accuſtomed to Calviniſtic preaching in the Church, and who have been perſuaded to conſider ſuch preaching excluſively as *evangelical*, will rather leave the church, and join the conventicle, than be deprived of ſuch edifying fanaticiſm. Add to this that Calviniſtic miniſters are never ſlow to inſinuate, nay, are frequently careful openly to declare that their neighbouring miniſters of Anti-Calviniſtic ſentiments, are "blind guides," and "dumb dogs," who know nothing of the doctrines of the church or of the ſcripture. They thus become the direct promoters of ſchiſm, and infamouſly betray the truſt repoſed in them. What elſe is the tendency of Mr. Overton's arrogant declaration: "*We*, then, are the *true Churchmen*; and Mr. Daubeny and his aſſociates are *Diſſenters?*"

"The evil of ſchiſm," ſays this excellent Churchman, "is ſo great, and the ſin of it ſo heinous, that every thing which is likely to promote it ought to be guarded againſt with the greateſt care; and, perhaps, there never was a time, when that care was more neceſſary than at preſent, there never was a time, when the duty of Church Communion was leſs underſtood in theory, or leſs attended to in practice. Many of the common people, taking upon themſelves to judge what is true doctrine and what is not, conſider it a ſufficient excuſe for frequenting a conventicle, that 'they hear there what is good.' To break the unity of the Church, and to encourage the preaching of thoſe who, not having given any ſecurity for preaching true doctrine, *may* preach falſe, is conſidered as a very venial offence, if an offence at all. The *perſon*, from whom they hear doctrines of which they approve, and the *place* in which they hear them, is, it ſeems, a circumſtance of but little importance."

"In the worſhip of God," continues Mr. Pearſon, "I once heard a ſenſible lay-man ſay, 'place ſignifies nothing, ſo that the *heart* be right.' When this maxim is taken by itſelf, what can be more true? When it is taken in reference to *ſocial* worſhip among Chriſtians, and alleged as an excuſe for neglecting the diſcipline eſtabliſhed in the Church, what can be more falſe? If individuals are to determine what *doctrines* are to be taught, and *who* is to teach them, what *places* and *times* are to be appropriated to public worſhip, and what *rites* and *ceremonies* are to be obſerved in it, what will

will ſoon become of Chriſtianity among us? In the minds and hearts of true believers, indeed, it muſt ever reign as the guide of their lives, and the ground of their deareſt hopes; but, conſidered as *a Church*, as a body of men united in the ſame faith and worſhip, of which Chriſt is the head, and of which it can truly be ſaid that 'by joints and bands having nourithment adminiſtered, and knit together, it increaſeth with the increaſe of God,' we ſhall probably look for it in vain. Beſides, to return to the maxim itſelf, is it likely that the *heart* can be altogether *right*, where there is a wilful neglect of obſervances which, if not preſcribed by Chriſt himſelf, are preſcribed by thoſe who have received authority from Chriſt to direct the ſteps of that flock over which the Holy Ghoſt hath made them overſeerers?" (Pp. 76—79.)

Mr. Pearſon remarks that, from the days of the early Puritans to thoſe of Whitefield and Weſley, the principal ſchiſms which have diſtracted our Church have all originated from Calviniſm. The followers of Weſley are generally regarded as Arminians; but this, Mr. Pearſon ſays, is a fallacy. In many opinions which are peculiarly Calviniſtic, particularly on the ſubjects of *juſtification*, of the *new birth*, and of what has been called the *faith of aſſurance*, the followers of both as cordially agree as they do in hoſtility to the diſcipline of the Church. Mr. Pearſon is right, and has produced from Weſley paſſages which are well deſerving of notice. "The Methodiſts had wandered many years in the new path of *ſalvation* by *faith and works*, before God ſhewed them the old way of *ſalvation by faith only*."—"My being born of God was an *inſtantaneous* act, enabling me, from that moment, to be more than conqueror over thoſe corruptions, which before I was always a ſlave to."—"I felt faith in Chriſt, and *an aſſurance* was given me that he had taken away my ſins, even *mine*." Mr. Pearſon, therefore, juſtly concludes that, whatever the followers of Weſley may think of *ſome* of the Lambeth articles, they would freely ſubſcribe to the fifth and ſixth. We are firmly perſuaded that he is not miſtaken when he adds, "My opinion is that, in doing ſo, they would, if certain hindrances did not ſtand in the way, be joined by the far greater part, if not the whole, of thoſe who are characterized by the term *evangelical*." (P. 85.)

We cannot conclude our extracts from this valuable pamphlet without inſerting the following, which is of ſingular importance.

"It will not be foreign to this part of the ſubject to obſerve that Calviniſtic preaching encourages the error, too prevalent among the lower orders of the people, of preferring, in the public ſervice, the *Sermon* to the *Prayers*. I would not deny the uſefulneſs of preaching when judiciouſly conducted, nor refuſe to it its due degree of eſtimation; but, certainly, when the Sermon is compared with the Prayers, it is of but inferior importance. In hearing a ſermon, we may, perhaps, be inſtructed in our duty, or excited to its performance; but in joining with ſincerity in the prayers, we are actually performing a conſiderable branch of our duty. Now, it has not eſcaped the obſervations of diſcerning perſons that, in the miniſtry of many of thoſe who are called *evangelical* preachers, there is often a careleſſneſs and haſte in the reading of the Liturgy, well adapted to excite a belief that the

the Prayers are not conſidered by the reader, what in fact they are, as the moſt important part of the ſervice, but merely as a decent introduction to the Sermon which is to follow. How far the gratification of *vanity*, and the deſire of 'preaching *themſelves*, not *Chriſt Jeſus the Lord*,' may be concerned in this, or how far it may ariſe from diſaffection to the Prayers themſelves, I ſhall not preſume to determine; but I am ſure that the thing itſelf is of very pernicious tendency." (Pp. 87—89.)

Mr. Pearſon, in the courſe of his remarks, has favoured us with a copy of a moſt extraordinary letter, which, as illuſtrative of the genuine ſpirit of our Evangelical Calviniſtic Methodiſts, it would be altogether unpardonable to withhold from our readers.

"I am always ſorry to find," he ſays, addreſſing himſelf to Mr. Overton, "that we are retrograde in liberality of thinking; and you, Sir, I am aſſured, will not be proud of an ally who, in his attempt to ſhield you from my attack, has manifeſted ſentiments of which even Baxter, the believer in *witchcraft*, and the perſecutor of thoſe accuſed of it, would have been aſhamed."

The letter, which had on it the *Leiceſter* poſt mark, was occaſioned by Mr. Pearſon's Remarks on Juſtification, and was as follows:

"REV. SIR,

"Practical infidels would thank you for your publication; but the peruſal of it produced no emotions in my mind but thoſe of grief and pity: grief that Rempſtone has ſuch a blind guide, and pity for you, reflecting on the conſequence of ſuch doctrines as your's."

"May God in mercy ſhew you the way of ſalvation, for as yet you are utterly a ſtranger to it; and may you, before death, become a TRUE CHURCHMAN; for *now* I ſcruple not to ſay you are not.

I am, Sir,
Your well-wiſher, and a *friend*,
Though not a *minister*
Of the Eſtabliſhment."

Mr. Pearſon, in a poſtſcript, ſays: "It is but juſt to add that, when Mr. Overton was informed of my having received the anonymous letter of which a copy is given, p. 59, he pronounced the ſending of it to be 'a cowardly attempt;' aſſuring me that 'he entertained very different ideas of ſuch principles as mine from thoſe expreſſed in the anonymous letter,' and that he viewed that letter with as great diſapprobation as I could do." How Mr. Overton could make ſuch a declaration we are totally at a loſs to conceive. To thoſe who have read Mr. Overton's book, the ſentiments of the letter-writer, compared with his, will appear, both as to matter and expreſſion, ſufficiently mild. Is Mr. Overton practiſed in the art of TRIMMING?

While Mr. Pearſon's pamphlet was in the preſs, he ſaw the maſterly publication of Dr. Kipling. It is a ſubject of pride to the Anti-Jacobin Reviewers that Mr. Pearſon's judgment with regard to that publi-

publication coincides with their own. "His treatiſe, with reſpect to the particular point [which] he had in view, ought, in my opinion, to be conſidered as deciſive, and to ſet it at reſt for ever."

The Hiſtory of Canada from its firſt Diſcovery; comprehending an Account of the original Eſtabliſhment of the Colony of Louiſiana. By George Herriot, Eſq. Deputy Poſtmaſter-General of Britiſh America. Vol. I. 8vo. Pp. 616. 12s. Longman and Rees. 1804.

NO regular hiſtory of Canada having been publiſhed in the Engliſh language Mr. Herriot propoſed to ſupply the deſideratum. In undertaking ſuch a taſk he ought to have conſidered by whom an Engliſh hiſtory of Canada was to be read, and in what view ſuch a hiſtory could be intereſting to Engliſh readers. Canada afforded a ſubject for an exhibition of ſavage life, that might have been inſtructive to any readers; but the work before us is chiefly a detail of events that are of little importance to readers of this country. It extends only to the year 1731, when Canada continued in poſſeſſion of the French; and our author informs us is chiefly compiled from Charlevoix's Hiſtory of New France. It was natural and proper for Charlevoix writing to Frenchmen to enumerate the various conteſts between his countrymen and the Indians; but an Engliſh writer ſhould have recollected that Engliſhmen care very little about the battles which the French fought with the Iroquois, Illionois, or any other ſavages in the ſeventeenth century. To our countrymen a hiſtory of Canada only begins to be important when the country becomes a ſubject of conteſt between France and England. An introductory chapter might have ſufficed for all the ſubject of the whole volume, and twenty-eight years more, down to the glorious 1759. Then Canada becomes truly intereſting to Britons, when they can contemplate Britiſh genius, courage, and ſkill, effecting ſplendid victory; but, lengthened out to a large volume, the production is very tedious. Having made theſe obſervations on the ſubject we ſhall now proceed to the plan and execution.

Our author deems it neceſſary to inform us that America was diſcovered by Chriſtopher Columbus, and that the ſucceſs of that navigator ſtimulated adventurers from other countries to attempt diſcoveries. Without repeating ſuch well known facts, and names, we go on to the actual hiſtory. Jacques Cardier effected a ſettlement on the banks of the St. Lawrence in 1534, and by an obvious policy joined ſome tribes of the natives againſt others. In 1540, a ſtronger eſtabliſhment was made, but we ſee nothing of the operations, ſo as to form any idea of the eaſe or difficulty; and, conſequently, of the qualities that were exerted. That defect is not totally in the ſubject, witneſs Robertſon's exhibition of ſmall tribes of Indians, long before he comes to the great empires of Mexico and Peru. The new eſtabliſhment was deſtroyed by ſome cauſe which has never been known.

The

The civil wars obſtructed the attention of the French from navigation for many years. But the Burbon hero having at length triumphed over all uſurpers, tranquillity returned, and France was able to reſume maritime enterprize. Champlain, a mariner, ſettled a colony, in 1608, at Quebec; concluded alliances with ſome Indian tribes, and went to war with the Iroquois, the chief tribe in that quarter.—Theſe conteſts are narrated with minute particularity; but without inſtructiveneſs or intereſt. The contentions even of ſavages may be rendered both inſtructive and intereſting by a writer who can exhibit in a ſtriking view the qualities of head and heart which they exert: but our author's pictures are not glowing.

After the death of Henry IV. the colony was for ſeveral years neglected; but Richelieu formed a plan for giving it ſtability; and veſted the management in the hands of a company. This corporation received ſeveral letters of nobility ſigned by the king, with blanks to be filled by ſuch names, as the company ſhould think proper. This we *conjecture*, but not from the hiſtory LEARN, was the origin of the Canadian nobleſſe: an order of men which Britiſh policy has regarded in eſtabliſhing a conſtitution for Canada. A ſettlement was now formed at Montreal, in the upper part of that country.

The ſecond book conſiſts principally of wars with the Iroquois. The narrative of theſe hoſtilities continues minute but unintereſting: ſome conferences are leſs inſipid, as they diſplay Indian manners: peace was at length concluded. Eccleſiaſtics now attained a conſiderable weight in the new colony; and uſed their authority in the acquiſition of wealth and power for their own order, fully as much as in the diffuſion of religion. The Jeſuits were peculiarly active; and under their management a ſeminary was eſtabliſhed.

In the third book we find the company ſurrendering their charter; and the colony included in the juriſdiction of the Weſt India Company. The ſame book contains an account of wars and fortifications; alſo of the converſion of Indian tribes to Chriſtianity. Frontenac arrived as governor in 1672, and being intelligent and inquiſitive he was at pains to learn the ſituation of the country to the weſtward of Canada. From the converſion of Indian tribes, the intercourſe increaſed between them and the Europeans, and miſſionaries had a ſafe acceſs to the interior parts. Father Marquette, one of theſe, learned that there was a very great river that had a ſouthern courſe. This he ſuppoſed either continued, and reached the Gulph of Mexico, or changed to a weſtern, and proceeded to the Pacific Ocean. He undertook to viſit the river, (the Miſſiſſippi;) ſucceeded, and received certain information of its courſe. La Sale, a mariner, ſailed down the river to its mouth in the Gulph of Mexico.

Military affairs occupy but a ſmall part of the fourth book. A conſiderable portion is devoted to the fur trade between the Indians and French. Great diſputes aroſe between the governor and churchmen, in which the former appears blameable: various changes were effected in the courts of law.

In the fifth book the Iroquois renewed the war; and France being now (in 1689) engaged in hoſtilities with her chief European neighbours, could not ſpare a great body of troops for the protection of her colony in North America; thence the Indians were ſucceſsful. The Engliſh co-operated with them: and Canada between the two enemies was greatly diſtreſſed. Frontenac endeavoured to incline the ſavages to peace; and, at length, ſucceeded. We are now conducted to the operations between the French and Engliſh in thoſe regions; but theſe of courſe are not new to the readers of the hiſtory of their country.

In the ſixth book we find the Iroquois again hoſtile to the French; and the narrative conſiſts of the ſame kind of deſultory operations as in the former wars.

The ſeventh opens with a negociation for peace, which is told with great prolixity of detail. While it was pending the Count de Frontenac died, (in 1698,) after having been twenty-ſix years governor of New France. He was an able, brave, diſintereſted man; but ambitious, proud, and imperious. His ſucceſſor de Callieres was more conciliatory; and his appointment facilitated the concluſion of the treaty with the Indians; the negociation terminated in a peace made at Montreal; he died in 1703. With talents, courage, and integrity, equal to his predeceſſor, de Callieres was endowed with much more moderation. The ſucceſſion war being now begun, the Iroquois were eaſily induced to renew hoſtilities in conjunction with the Engliſh; with theſe the ſeventh book is cloſed. The eighth goes on with the ſame ſubject till the peace of Utrecht. The French now proceeded with undivided ſtrength againſt the Iroquois, whom they completely conquered; and here ends the account of Canada.

The ninth book proceeds to Louiſiana, the name given by the French to the country on the banks of the Miſſiſſippi. La Sale having, as we have ſeen, diſcovered the mouth of that river, propoſed to find it from ſea. He ſailed from France with that intent; arrived at St. Domingo; proceeded, about the gulph, and aſcended a river, but found it was not the one he wanted. Making various other attempts he failed in his enterprize.

In the tenth Mr. D'Abberville undertook this diſcovery. From St. Domingo he took a more eaſtern courſe than that in which La Sale had miſcarried, and ſoon ſucceeded in his purpoſe; and having ſailed up the river, conſtructed a fort in the country of the Natchez, the chief tribe of Louiſiana.

The eleventh, which is the laſt book, proceeds with fortifications, and other diſpoſitions for ſecuring the ſettlement. Theſe include civil regulations. Our author in this book introduces a commercial and political account of Louiſiana, and alſo a view of the manners of the Natchez, and their tranſactions with the French. They at firſt pretended great friendſhip towards the new comers, but were really meditating their deſtruction. They formed a conſpiracy for that purpoſe, and maſſacred two hundred; but they were ſtopped in their career, and entirely ſubdued.

As

As the French advanced along the banks of the Miſſiſſippi, their progreſs alarmed other India tribes; and among theſe the Chicachees, between whom and them a bloody war commenced, and here the volume cloſes.

From this analyſis our readers will be able to form a judgment of the materials of the work. The arrangement is chronological and clear: the language is eaſy and perſpicuous. The production is by no means deficient in uſeful facts; but requires to be very much curtailed to be intereſting.

The Synonymes of the Latin Language, alphabetically arranged, with Critical Diſſertations upon the force of its Prepoſitions, both in a ſimple and compounded State. By John Hill, L. L. D. Profeſſor of Humanity in the Univerſity, and Fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh. Quarto. Pp. 796. 1l. 11s. 6d. Longman and Rees, London; Manners and Miller, Edinburgh. 1804.

THIS is a very elaborate work, on a ſubject attended with peculiar difficulties. To apprehend, with accuracy, the nice ſhades of meaning which diſtinguiſh thoſe words denominated SYNONYMOUS is, even in the caſe of our native tongue, no eaſy taſk: to explain them intelligibly and happily to others is more difficult ſtill. To ſucceed in ſuch diſcuſſions requires not only the moſt perfect knowledge of a language, but ſuch delicacy of diſcrimination, and ſuch correctneſs of thinking, as fall to the ſhare comparatively of but few. In all theſe reſpects the SYNONYMES FRANÇOIS of the Abbe Girard is deſerving of the higheſt praiſe. It is, indeed, a work of ſingular merit, to which we know nothing, in any language, that deſerves to be compared, and which, we think, will hardly ever be excelled.

But he who undertakes to explain the ſynonymous words of a dead language has obſtacles to encounter of a moſt formidable kind.

"Quod in vernaculâ linguâ," ſays another ingenious Frenchman, M. Gardin Dumeſnil, "feliciter executus eſt Scriptor Gallicus, id in Latinâ ſi tentarem, operæ pretium eſſe me facturum exiſtimavi. Neque feſellit meum inter et illius incœptum quantum intereſſet. Singularem enim Clariſſimi viri perſpicaciam non parum adjuvit nativi ſermonis, quotidiana et commoda tractatio, vivos appellandi copia, et crebræ cum doctiſſimis et acutiſſimis viris de verborum, ſenſu diſceptationes. Mihi vero, præter quam quod ab illâ ſagacitate longe abſum, haud ita familiaris et obvia fuit in linguâ veteri verborum proprietas, et multiplex locutionum uſus. Mortuos interroganti non reſpondent manes dubitanti non licuit cum Livii et Ciceronis æqualibus confabulari. At iſta," continues the ſame learned writer, "me non deterruit operis difficultas. Spirat adhuc in egregiis antiquorum lucubrationibus ipſorum mens, quæ pene tota in legentium et aſſidue meditantium animos transfunditur. Occulta non ſemper fugiunt inveſtigantem. Similia vix fallunt ab omni parte comparantem. Neque adeo pauca ſuperſunt Latinorum ſcripta, ut non ſatis ampla ſuppetat conferendi inter ſe, et opponendi materia, nec poſſit obſcuris quidquam alicunde lucis afferri. Verum qui

plurimum in hiſce videat, cum non modo, perſpicacem, ſed etiam in antiquorum lectione ſic opportet eſſe verſatum, ut optimi cujuſque Scriptoris ingenium penitus quaſi combiberit, et ad verborum omnium vim et collocationem attenderit."

Whether even the moſt accompliſhed modern ſcholars have thus thoroughly imbibed the ſpirit of the ancient languages, may, we think, be very reaſonably doubted. The lover of claſſical learning, it is true, is, by no means, deſtitute of much valuable aſſiſtance for aſcertaining the preciſe import of terms. In the Latin language, the great Roman orator and philoſopher himſelf, than whom no man ever more thoroughly underſtood his native tongue, has left, on this ſubject, a great variety of obſervations, of which the utility cannot be too highly prized. Many maſterly notices of the ſame kind are communicated by Varro, Quinctilian, and Seneca. From Aſcopius Pedianus, Nonius Marcellus, Feſtus, Donatus, and Servius, abundant information of this nature may be derived; nor ought other names of a later date to be paſſed in ſilence. By the ardent admirer of claſſical literature thoſe of Iſidere of Seville, Scioppius, Vavaſſeur, Sealiger, Henry Stevens, Geſner, and others, will never be mentioned but with gratitude and reſpect. Such writers have been called "the pioneers of literature;" and many have affected to ſpeak of them with contempt. This deſpicable pedantry (for of pedantry there are various and even oppoſite kinds) owes no ſmall part of its reputation to the peeviſh and ſplenetic petulance of Pope, who, having failed moſt egregiouſly in attempting to ſettle the text of Shakeſpeare, (an undertaking for which he had no qualifications,) declared open war againſt all verbal critics and criticiſm. His authority was high, and, on many accounts, deſerved to be ſo. It was, therefore, eagerly laid hold of by thoſe who thought that the moſt effectual way to ſcreen their own ignorance of ancient learning was to depreciate the ſtudies of men who had laboured, with indefatigable application, and with aſtoniſhing ſucceſs, to explain the leſs obvious elegancies of the languages in which that learning is contained.

But however frequently we may be entertained by eloquent declamations on the dulneſs and dryneſs of verbal criticiſm, we may lay it down as univerſally true, that the authors of theſe declamations are either deſtitute of ſolid ſenſe and of correct taſte, or that, ſunk in habits of confirmed idleneſs, they want the courage to encounter ſuch difficulties as muſt be ſurmounted in order to acquire a competent acquaintance with the precious remains of the ancient claſſics. No maxim was ever better founded than that of Lord Coke: "Nomina ſi neſcis, perit cognitio rerum." The induſtrious ſtudent, therefore, will carefully peruſe and digeſt the information conveyed in the writings of ſuch men as we have mentioned. We think with the very ingenious Beauzée, who republiſhed, and conſiderably augmented the SYNONYMES FRANÇOIS of Girard, that a very uſeful volume might be compiled from the lucubrations of theſe eminent ſcholars, eſpecially

cially from ſuch of them as more immediately relate to the differences of ſynonymous words.

" Un pareil livre avertiroit les jeunes étudians qu'il y a dans les auteurs Latins une infinité des vues fines et delicates, dont l'ignorance doit rendre les Latiniſtes modernes fort ſuſpects, et leurs admirateurs bien circonſpects. Mais ſi les anciens avoient pris eux-mêmes le ſoin de jeter ſur toute leur langue ce coup d'œil philoſophique, qui apprécie avec juſteſſe l'énergie de chaque terme, nous verrions entre ces mots, dit M. d'Alembert, une infinité de nuances qui nous échappent dans une langue morte, et qui doivent nous faire ſentir combien le premier des humaniſtes modernes eſt éloigné de ſavoir le Latin."

No man who has any tincture of letters is ignorant how much, as well of the beauty, as of the accuracy of compoſition, depends on the proper choice of words; for nothing is more certain than that every thought has its appropriate expreſſion, which can ſeldom be changed without obvious diſadvantage. The great Roman orator, in the firſt book of his treatiſe " De Oratore," giving ſome account of his juvenile ſtudies, has a very remarkable paſſage to this purpoſe.

" In quotidianis autem exercitationibus equidem mihi adoleſcentulus proponere ſolebam illam exercitationem maxime, ut aut verſibus propoſitis quam maxime gravibus, aut oratione aliquâ lectâ ad eum finem quem memoriâ poſſem comprehendere, eam rem ipſam, quam legiſſem, *verbis aliis* quam maxime poſſem lectis, pronunciarem. Sed poſt animadverti hoc eſſe in hoc vitii, quod ea verba, quæ maxime cujuſque rei propria, quæque eſſent ornatiſſima atque optima, occupaſſet aut Ennius, ſi ad ejus verſus me exercerem, aut Gracchus, ſi ejus orationem mihi forte propoſuiſſem: ita, ſi *iisdem verbis* uterer, nihil prodeſſe; ſi *aliis*, etiam obeſſe, cum minus idoneis uti conſueſcerem."

On the principle here laid down by Cicero, that, on every ſubject, a good writer will make choice of the moſt proper terms, Mr. Beauzée has condemned the *literal interpretation*, which accompanies moſt of the Latin claſſics *in uſum Delphini*; and, although we have long been accuſtomed to regard, with a feeling ſomewhat approaching to veneration, the labours of thoſe learned Jeſuits, who have ſo well elucidated the ancient authors, yet we cannot but acknowledge that, to us, the cenſure of their ingenious countryman appears well founded.

" Si les anciens," he ſays, " pouvoient revivre, et aujourd'hui devenir juges de nos compoſitions, de quel œil verroient-ils ces prétendues interprétations Latines que l'on a jointes à leurs textes pendant le regne dernier, ſous prétexte d'en faciliter l'étude au Dauphin, et dans leſquelles on a affecté d'éviter les mots et les tours qu'ils avoient employes? Et-il poſſible qu'aucun de ceux qui s'en ſont occupés, n'ait vu que ce travail étoit plus propre à gâter le goût qu'à l'eclairer, et n'étoit bon qu'à rendre inſenſible ſur la propriété et l'énergie des termes, et ſur les fineſſes de la langue?"

In a preface of ſome length, but occaſionally obſcure, Dr. Hill has favoured us with ſome general obſervations on ſynonymous terms.

"The word '*ſynonymous*,' he ſays, "is often ſuppoſed applicable to ſuch terms only as denote preciſely the ſame conception. Some words occur, in the different languages, ſo ſtrictly equivalent that their meaning is not to be diſtinguiſhed." The number of theſe, however, is, we are perſuaded, in every language, ſo ſmall as ſcarcely to deſerve attention. They are, we believe, entirely confined to the expreſſion of the moſt ſimple conceptions; nor do we ſuppoſe that, in any language, any complex terms, ſignificant of what Locke calls *mixed modes*, will be found preciſely equivalent. Our author, however, is of opinion that "the multiplicity of ſuch terms increaſes the harmony of ſpeech, and gives the poet and the orator an advantage in the practice of their reſpective arts." We are far from thinking this opinion juſt: on the contrary, we are convinced that a multiplicity of ſuch terms would be a glaring defect. The learned Profeſſor himſelf allows, that "were a redundance of this kind to pervade a language completely, the ſame people might be ſaid to ſpeak, at leaſt, two languages at once." With regard to the notion that terms perfectly equivalent contribute to harmony, and confer advantages on the orator and poet, we are inclined to conſider it as altogether chimerical. It ſeems grounded on the principle that the frequent recurrence of the ſame word ought, as much as poſſible, to be avoided. But this principle, we apprehend, is not to be admitted without certain reſtrictions.—Needleſsly, indeed, to repeat the ſame word muſt be always diſagreeable; but the repetition will never offend when the ſenſe requires it. Were this the caſe, the moſt offenſive claſs of words, in every language, would be the pronouns, which yet, we know, give offence to nobody. There is, however, of terms which are commonly ſtyled ſynonymous, a much more numerous and important claſs, concerning which our author ſpeaks more accurately.

"Such terms," he ſays, "take their character, not from the identity of the conceptions [which] they denote, but from the *analogy* [the author means *resemblance*] by which thoſe conceptions are allied. They preſent differences which, like ſhades of the ſame colour, bear a common relation to one generic idea. When the point of general co-incidence, and the ground of particular diverſity, in terms ſo diſcriminated, are aſcertained, it is in the power of the writer to uſe them with propriety. He may then know which to adopt, and which to reject, and can reconcile embelliſhment with accuracy and preciſion: for the moſt delicate variety in thought he is furniſhed with a correſponding variety in expreſſion. He arranges terms upon preciſely the ſame principles that apply to things; ſo that the language, in which he conveys his idea, becomes a complete picture of the idea itſelf. If the vulgar had not a confuſed apprehenſion of differences which the learned only can define, they would be almoſt debarred from the uſe of ſpeech. The points, at the ſame time, that are ſpecific, and involve the definition of terms, eſcape their notice, as if they had no exiſtence." (Pref. Pp. iii. iv.)

Neglecting, then, thoſe few words in a language which may happen to be exactly equivalent to each other, we rightly conceive of ſynonymous terms when we view any ſet of them as conveying one principal

cipal idea in common; which principal idea is diverſified in each by a particular combination with one or more acceſſary ideas ſuperadded to it. In as far as the conception denoted by the terms is the ſame, they are ſynonymous; in as far as it is diverſified they are different; and they are properly explained when their agreement and differences are diſtinctly pointed out. Dr. Hill has, therefore, formed a very accurate notion of the principle which ought to direct the grammarian in unfolding the import of ſynonymous words.

"In ſtating," he ſays, "the power of the different terms brought together, he had adopted, of himſelf, the plan of Monſieur D'Alembert, and has been uniformly guided by an expreſſion of the point in which they all agree. Reverſing afterwards the ſynthetic method, by which this point was at firſt apprehended, he has tried to ſhew, by a variety of examples of claſſical authority, how each of the terms collated holds of that general definition, to which they all refer as a ſtandard." (Pref. p. xii.)

Of the various authors, who have occaſionally written on the ſynonymes of the Latin tongue, we could wiſh that the learned Profeſſor had favoured us with a ſhort account, diſtinguiſhing their reſpective merits, and informing us from which of them he derived moſt aſſiſtance in the compoſition of his laborious work. In his preface he ſpeaks of certain Dutch and German critics in general terms of reſpect; but the only names that are particularly mentioned, are thoſe of Popma, Noltenius, Schellerus, and Geſner. We conclude, of courſe, that he has not ſeen the very learned and ingenious work of Gardin Dumeſnil, of whoſe ſenſible dedication to the Univerſity of Paris we have given a ſpecimen. It was publiſhed in 1777, with the expreſs approbation of the Univerſity, and is modeſtly intituled "*Synonymes Latine, et leurs différentes ſignifications, avec des examples tirés des meilleurs auteurs; à l'imitation des Synonymes François de M. l'Abbé Girard.*" We cannot, indeed, help being of opinion that this is a much better choſen title than that which Dr. Hill has prefixed to his book. He calls it "THE Synonymes of the Latin Language;" a deſignation which rather unfortunately ſuggeſts that, in the author's eſtimation, he has exhauſted the ſubject. This, however, it ought in juſtice to be obſerved, is merely an overſight; for the learned Profeſſor was far from intending to convey to his readers any ſuch inſinuation. "Though the liſt of theſe," he ſays, meaning ſynonymous words, "which it is afterwards attempted to explain, be numerous, it is ſtill ſuſceptible of addition. If the plan adopted *is* [be] approved of, it may be purſued by others more ſucceſsfully, and to a greater extent." (Pref. p. xi.) In conformity with this idea, the title of his book ought certainly to have been ſimply "Synonymes of the Latin Language," without the article: a title which would have accurately ſignified that the work contained an explanation of any indefinite number of terms. The Profeſſor adds, indeed, "It is underſtood, however, that by far the greateſt number of Latin terms, that can be juſtly oppoſed to each other, will be found in this collection." (Ibid.) But in this he lies, we think, under a great miſtake. His volume comprehends

prehends the interpretation of not quite 1000 words, while that of the Frenchman diſcuſſes, at leaſt, four times as many: nor do very many of thoſe admitted by the latter appear to us to occupy their place in conſequence of a dubious claim. It may be added that, while the work of Dr. Hill contains nearly 800 large quarto pages, that of Dumeſnil conſiſts of no more than 522 in ſmall octavo. Of theſe two publications we are not here appreciating the reſpective merits; we are ſpeaking only of the comparative number of words which they include, and of the difference of their ſize.

When the *manner* of theſe two authors is compared, it is impoſſible to conceive a greater contraſt. It ſeems as if they had made a complete exchange of their national characters. Dr. Hill is, in general, elaborate and diffuſe; Dumeſnil always concentrated and ſimple. The former diſplays a perpetual affectation of profound remark; the latter ſeems to have had no other object but to give the exact diſtinctions of words in the plaineſt language poſſible. Hence the former continually reminds us of a French, and the latter of an Engliſh, writer. Our readers cannot fail, we think, to obſerve the very ſtriking oppoſition between their two ſtyles, in the following explanations of *Inſomnis* and *Vigil*. A fairer ſpecimen of both the works could hardly be produced.

HILL.——— "INSOMNIS, VIGIL,

agree, in denoting wakefulneſs, but differ, in reſpect to the cauſe from which it proceeds. The firſt, from 'in' and 'ſomnus,' denotes the want of ſleep, *from diſeaſe, or from fear, or any ſtrong mental emotion.* 'Et explorato, jam profectos amicos, noctem quietam, utque affirmatur, non *insomnem* egit.' TAC. *Hiſt.* 2. 49. *Though, in the caſe of Otho, before he killed himſelf, there was a cauſe for want of ſleep, yet the cauſe, it ſhould ſeem, was too feeble, and he did enjoy it.*

Collucent igneſ: noctemque cuſtodia ducit
Inſomnem ludo. VIRG. *Æn.* 9. 166.

" *Here, the guards paſs a ſleepleſs night, not from diſeaſe or fear, but from exceſſive mirth.*

——Ille *notis* [Notis] actus ad Oricum
Poſt inſana Capræ ſidera, frigidus
Noctes non ſine multis
Insomnis lacrymis agit. HOR. *Car.* 3. 7. 5.

" *Such was the diſtreſs of Gyges, in the abſence of Aſteria, that it robbed him of his reſt.*

" From '*insomnis*' comes 'inſomnia,' as an abſtract, which ſignifies reſtleſsneſs. 'Incitabatur *insomnia* maxime; neque enim plus quam tribus nocturnis horis quieſcebat.'—SUET. *Cal.* 50. 'Captivos *insomnia* cruciatos interiiſſe.'—GELL. 4. 6. *Insomnium*, again, which appears generally in the plural number, only ſignifies the dream [ſignifies only the dream] which gives uneaſineſs during ſleep, and thereby breaks it. 'Caret ergo etiam vinolentia, et cruditate, et inſomniis.'—CIC. *de Sen.* 86. a.

Dii meliora ferant, nec ſint inſomnia vera. TIBULL. 3. 4. 1.

VIGIL

"VIGIL differs from 'Insomnis,' in implying, that the want of sleep proceeds from a sense of duty, leading to a disposition to watch.

Quaque *Vigil* custos, præteriturus eram. OVID. *Art. Am.* 3. 612.

————Invenies, tu tantum providus astu
Tende animum *vigilem.* STAT. *Achill.* 1. 543.

Monstrum horrendum, ingens: cui quot sunt corpore plumæ,
Tot *vigiles* oculi subter,————
Nocte volat, cœli medio terræque per umbram
Stridens, nec dulci declinat lumina somno. VIRG. *Æn.* 4. 181.

"From this inimitable and *picturesque* description of Fame, the correctness of the definitions of *Vigil,* on which term its merit rests, may be inferred. 'Nox per diversa inquies: cum barbare festis epulis, læto cantu, aut truci sonore, subjecta vallium ac resultantis saltus complerent; apud Romanos invalidi ignes, interruptæ voces, atque ipsi passim adjacerent vallo, oberrarent tentoriis, 'insomnes' magis quam *pervigiles,* ducemque terruit dira quies.)—TACIT. *Ann.* 1. 65. The Germans were 'insomnes' entirely, as they wanted sleep by a voluntary indulgence in the joys of a feast. With the Romans, however, the case was not similar. They were restless from anxiety, *though they did not observe the same regularity in their watches, for which they were in general remarkable.*" (Pp. 451,—453.)

DUMESNIL.———— "*Insomnis, Exsomnis, Vigil.*

INSOMNIS, *qui ne dort point, d'in et de* somnus. Oberrant insomnes magisquam pervigiles. Tacit. Noctem insomnem ducere. Virg. EXSOMNIS, *qui ne dort plus,* (quasi) e somno. Non secus in jugis exsomnis stupet Evias. Hor. VIGIL, *qui veille.* Vigiles oculi. Virg. Canum Vigilum excubiæ. Hor. Vigil *differe d'*insomnis, 1mo. *en ce qu'il suppose de l'attention, et une sorte d'activité, lorsqu'il est appliqué aux personnes*; 2do. *en ce qu'il s'applique aux choses qui ne sont pas naturellement susceptibles de sommeil.* Lucernæ Vigiles. Hor. Vigil ignis. Virg. *On ne pourroit pas dire* insomnes lucernæ, *ni* ignis insomnis." (Pp. 332, 333.)

We are tempted to give yet another specimen, in which the difference of manner between these learned grammarians is still more strongly marked.

HILL,———— "FIGURA, FORMA,

agree, in referring to the *manner, in which the surfaces of bodies, tangible and visible, terminate, and to the relation which their different extremities bear to each other.* FIGURA, however, relates to the arbitrary termination of surfaces, without regard to any genus to which the bodies presenting them are understood to belong. 'Forma,' again, always supposes a defined shape, by which, as a pattern, certain individuals, though deviating slightly from each other, are held together as a genus. The varieties of which *Figura* is susceptible, *from the possible combinations of bounding lines, differing in length and in curvature,* are infinite; those of 'Forma,' on the other hand, are limited by necessary approximations to a standard.

"*That the Romans understood there was intention in the agent, who imparted both qualities to matter, is evident from what Varro says of the terms.* 'Fictor, cum dicit, Fingo, *figuram* imponit; cum dicit, Informo, 'Formam.'—VARRO *de Ling. Lat.* L. 5.

"He

" He 'qui fingit,' or 'dat figuram,' then, is ſuppoſed to act from intention, and follows a pattern exiſting only in his own imagination. The rudeſt maſs, accordingly, to which *figura* is applied, is not underſtood to have taken its ſhape fortuitouſly. Its ſurface is ſuppoſed to terminate according to the will of the Creator, though it terminates in a way peculiar to itſelf.

" FORMA is a leſs general term than 'Figura.' *The latter is the inſeparable concomitant of matter*, [what would the followers of Ariſtotle ſay to this philoſophy?] which the former is not, becauſe it ſuggeſts extenſion, limited by fixed boundaries. Were there but one object in nature, it would poſſeſs 'Figura,' but not *Forma*. If we ſuppoſe no plurality of maſſes, the idea of ſtandard and copy is neceſſarily deſtroyed; and, of courſe, that attribute of divided matter, denoted by *Forma*, muſt periſh along with it.

" The definition which Cicero gives of *Forma*, in a figurative ſenſe, is juſtly applicable to it in its literal. '*Forma* eſt notio cujus differentia ad caput generis, et quaſi fontem referri poteſt.'—CIC. *Topic.* 223. a. Again, he ſays, 'Cum quæritur quæ *forma* et quaſi naturalis nota cujuſque ſit.'—*de Orat.* 153. b.

" *Forma* is taken to denote a ſtamp, among the different impreſſions of which the ſtricteſt poſſible ſimilarity muſt exiſt. 'Omnia facta dictaque tua inter ſe congruant, et reſpondeant ſibi, ut una *forma* percuſſa ſint.—SENEC. *Ep.* 34. It is alſo made to expreſs a ſhoemaker's laſt, which may differ from others of the ſame kind, both in ſize and ſhape, but ſtill exhibits a pattern, from which there can be no deviation.

> Si ſcalpra et *formas* non ſutor, nautica vela
> Averſus mercaturis, delirus et amens
> Undique dicatur merito. HOR. *Sat.* 2. 3. 106.

" There are ſeveral paſſages in Cicero, in which 'Figura' and *Forma* are very happily oppoſed, ſo as to aid our reſearches in diſcovering the power of each. As when he ſays, 'Omnium animantium *formam* vincit hominis 'figura.'—CIC. *de Nat. Deor.* 11. a. In the interpretation of this ſentence, it is to be obſerved that the term *Formam* refers to that defined ſhape, by which every different ſpecies of animals, except man, is diſcriminated. The term 'figura' has, indeed, a reference to the ſhape of the human body; not, however, as exhibiting a ſtandard for a ſpecies, but as contradiſtinguiſhed to the bodies of all other animals, beſide man. It refers to no pattern ever exhibited, but to one that pre-exiſted in the divine mind, before man had any being; *and into this were incorporated certain mental powers, which might have been united with a mass of matter differently modelled.* Had the place of the two terms compared been reverſed, thus: 'Omnium animantium 'figuram' vincit hominum '*forma*,' the meaning of the expreſſion would have been altered, and its general preciſion impaired. The term 'Figura' might, with ſufficient diſtinctneſs, have been applied to the *abstract shape* [pray what is that?] which marks any one particular ſpecies of animals, oppoſed to the reſt, but not to all the ſpecies except that one. In the uſe made, by Cicero, of *Forma*, it preſerves the diſtinctneſs of the claſſes, and holds forth the ſhape, which is characteriſtic of each, as the ſubject of compariſon with that of man.

" Cicero, elſewhere, has the following remarkable ſentence: 'Hoc dico, non ab hominibus *formæ* 'figuram' veniſſe ad Deos. Non, ergo, illorum humana *forma*, ſed noſtra divina dicenda eſt.'—CIC. *de Nat. Deor.* 1. 90. The *abstract shape* [again!] denoted by " Figura,' is here very clearly made to characterize

characterize the particular one adopted to mark the ſpecies, either of gods or men. The words '*formam* figuræ' would have involved an abſurdity. They would have preſented a circumſtance, as deſcriptive of a general term, by means of one more particular than itſelf." (Pp. 373—375.)

DUMESNIL.——" *Figura, Forma, Statura.*

" FIGURA, *la figure, de* fingere. Figura *distingue les individus, et tient plus de l'art; au lieu que* forma *a plus de raport à la nature.* FORMA *caracterise, les especes, forme, conformation.* Figura totius oris et corporis. Cic. Formæ figura. Cic. *Au figure:* vocis figura. Cic. Negotii figura. Cic. *La tournure d'une affaire.* Homini, cùm de Deo cogitat, forma occurrit humana. Cic. Forma eſt naturalis nota cujuſque. Cic. *Cet exemple prouve que forma est plutôt l'effet, de la nature,* naturalis, *naturelle, essentielle, et non pas accidentelle. De même:* Omnium animantium formas vincit hominis figura. Cic. STATURA, *la stature, la hauteur du corps, de* Statuere. Velim mihi dicas quâ facie fuerit, quâ Staturâ." (Pp. 270, 271.)

There are few, we imagine, who will not be diſpoſed to prefer, in theſe inſtances, the conciſe and clear explanation of the Frenchman to the dark and verboſe diſcuſſions of Dr. Hill. The profeſſor appears to us to be a good Latin ſcholar; and his book would have been very uſeful, if he had given us only facts; that is, if he had ſimply ſtated the original and ſecondary meanings of his terms, and proved them by examples, without troubling us with long and perplexed commentaries. Unluckily his great ambition ſeems to have been to figure as a deep philoſopher and metaphyſician. " He preſumes to aſſiſt the philoſophic inquirer upon points of deep reſearch." (Pref. p. xii.) This, however, is, as far as we are able to judge, a department in which he is not fitted to excel. " He is convinced," he ſays, " that it is impoſſible either to abridge theſe diſcuſſions, by which the force of contraſted ſynonymes is unfolded, or to render them intelligible to boys." (Pref. p. xiii.) We, on the other hand, are fully convinced that both are very poſſible. If the author had greatly abridged his diſcuſſions, which might eaſily be done, they would have been infinitely more valuable than they are. And with regard to boys, we know, from experience, that it is no peculiarly difficult taſk to make even very young ones comprehend, with ſufficient accuracy, the difference between ſynonymous terms. Such knowledge, we are ready, indeed, to allow, will not often be communicated to them by the diſquiſitions of Dr. Hill: for the learned profeſſor is frequently ſo profound as to puzzle the perceptive faculties both of men and of boys. What, for inſtance, can be gathered from the following definition: " ÆQUALIS, PAR, SIMILIS, agree, in denoting certain diſtinct relations, by which ſeparate ſubſtances may be allied." (P. 45.) Does the reader now know *in what* theſe words agree? But our author's ſpeculations with regard to them are throughout extremely curious. We ſhall copy a part of them; and others, we truſt, will find them more ſatisfactory than we have done.

Æqualis denotes, that the ſame quantity reſides in the wholes, or in certain

tain parts, of two or more ſubjects." This is ſurely a very ſingular diſplay of metaphyſical powers! How could it eſcape the ingenious profeſſor that he here aſſerts a phyſical impoſſibility? For, without all doubt, it is phyſically impoſſible that *the ſame* quantity ſhould reſide in the wholes, or in the parts, of *different ſubjects*. But by *ſame* in this place, he really means *equal*. His propoſition is, therefore, a perfect example of thoſe which are called, by logicians, IDENTICAL, and ſignifies only that "equality denotes equality." He goes on, however, to give us more information. "*By quantity is underſtood whatever can be meaſured, and its equality is aſcertained by the abſolute agreement between the ſubjects meaſured, and one ſtandard to which they are all applied.*" All this, unqueſtionably, is perfectly true; but how it contributes to explain *æqualis*, or indeed to give us any one idea which we had not before, we cannot conceive. If, after peruſing the nice diſtinctions which we are going to ſubjoin, our readers ſhould ſtill be at a loſs to apprehend the preciſe and full import of the Latin term PAR, their misfortune will, certainly, not be owing to want of pains, at leaſt, on the part of the Profeſſor.

"PAR differs from 'Æqualis' in denoting the proportion of quantity, in two ſubjects, and in ſuppoſing that that in each is meaſured, either by a common ſtandard, or by one peculiar to each. When each quantity is meaſured by its own ſtandard, the proportion between the two is regularly ſtated, and more diſtinctly preſerved. When the ſtandard of both again is common, the relation of proportion approaches to that of equality, and is apt to be confounded with it. Thus, they who are ſaid to be 'pares ætate,' may have been born about, or even in the ſame year, *ſo that what is paſt in the life of each bears the ſame proportion to the ordinary life of man*; but unleſs the events of their birth had been ſimultaneous [that is, reader, unleſs they had both been *born at the ſame inſtant of time*,] a mathematical, which is the only real equality, could not have exiſted in reſpect to their age. The latter is aſcertained by the number of years, and their diviſions, that have expired ſince the birth; the former, [what does this word refer to?] by the proportion borne by that interval to the uſual extent of life. '*Par* eſt quod in omnes 'æquale' eſt.' CIC. *de Juven.* 68. This definition is ſtrictly logical, and announces that the equality of the relation between each of the ſubjects and its ſtandard, forms that of parity, or defined proportion, among the whole. 'Verbum Latinum *par* Græco et idem valens.' CIC. *de fin.* b. If the word *par* denoted abſolute equality, the laſt member of this ſentence would form a complete tautology, and have no meaning. *Par* denotes *the relation borne by each word in the two languages to the reſpective vocabulary of which it was a part*, and 'idem valens,' that the quantity of conception, tranſmitted by each, was not an approximation to equality, but preciſely the ſame." (P. 46.)

In this, as in many other inſtances, we think that Mr. Profeſſor Hill, has darkened inſtead of illuſtrating his ſubject. Every thing, indeed, moſt reprehenſible in his book, ariſes from his rage for philoſophizing. This is the fatal rock on which he ſplits: for whenever he aims at more than ordinary acuteneſs, he is apt to trifle, or to become inconſiſtent, looſe, and obſcure. "In the degrees of folly, denoted

denoted by *Stultus*, there was *a variety proportioned to the general inattention of the perſon to whom it is applicable, or his particular inattention in a ſingle act.*"

Stultior Stulto fuiſti, qui iis tabellis crederes. PLAUT. *Curc.* 4. 3. 19.

"*The exiſtence of folly in the conduct of an agent appears in the poſitive Stulto, and an increaſed degree of it in the comparative Stultior.*' (P. 719.) Is it poſſible that Dr. Hill could ſuppoſe that he was inſtructing us in the ſcience of grammar when he was making ſuch impertinent and trivial remarks? "When a ſurgeon was ſaid 'ſecare venam,' he, by means of his lancet, only ſeparated the part which he touched, *without directly impairing the quantity of matter in the body of his patient, as if he had cut off a limb.*" (P. 684.) What important philoſophy! But the learned author has forgotten to tell us, what is of equal importance, that the deſign of a ſurgeon, in opening a vein, is always to impair, indirectly at leaſt, the quantity of matter in the body of his patient. For with all due deference to the better judgment of our accurate Profeſſor, and even of the reſpectable Royal College of Surgeons, ſuch, we apprehend, muſt be the effect when a ſurgeon takes from the body of his patient ſome ounces of blood.

A number of Dr. Hill's definitions convey no preciſe ideas at all. Of this we have already produced one inſtance in the caſe of *æqualis, ſimilis*, and *par*. It is proper, however, to give a few more. "*Curvare, flectere, plicare*, agree in denoting the act of altering the form of ſome ſubſtance, but differ, in reſpect either to the force requiſite for that purpoſe, or to the natural elaſticity of the ſubſtance, by which it recovers its original ſhape." (P. 258.) The circumſtances in which theſe verbs are ſaid to differ have evidently nothing to do with the meaning of the verbs themſelves; and the circumſtance in which they are ſaid to agree forms no diſtinctive characteriſtic. It is juſt as applicable to *addere, demere, complanare, cremare*, and numberleſs other verbs, as to theſe. For they all "denote the act of altering the form of ſome ſubſtance." "*Sinus, Gremium*, agree in denoting a ſpace formed by a certain poſition of the body, but differ, in reſpect to the manner in which that ſpace is formed." (P. 702.) From this formal ſtatement what information is gained? We will venture to ſay, that he who, before having read it, was ignorant of the meaning of theſe two words, will be equally ignorant ſtill. The truth of the matter is, that the words of a language are almoſt always better explained by ſimply giving us the equivalent terms, than by the moſt laboured attempts at general definition. Such attempts, indeed, give an author the appearance of learning and acuteneſs; but they frequently end in talking much and ſaying nothing. This was properly ſeen by Girard and Dumeſnil, who ſeldom engage in thoſe ſtrong diſcuſſions in which Dr. Hill ſeems to think that his greateſt merit conſiſts. *Sinus* and *Gremium* are, accordingly, by Dumeſnil, without any affectation of ſuperior penetration, thus ſimply diſtinguiſhed. "SINUS, *la ſein, la partie qui eſt au-deſſus de la poitrine, entre les deux*

deux bras. GREMIUM, *le giron, la partie qui eſt au-deſſous de la poitrine.*" (Pp. 472, 473.) Many ſimilar examples might readily be produced where the Frenchman's ſimplicity has fully ſucceeded, while Dr. Hill's refinement has completely failed. Dr Hill, himſelf, though from his general obſervation on *Sinus* and *Gremium* we gather nothing, when he comes to explain the words particularly is ſufficiently intelligible: "SINUS," he ſays, "properly ſignifies the boſom, and is defined by Valla, 'pars illa, quæ eſt intra pectoris brachiorumque complexum.' GREMIUM differs from 'Sinus,' in denoting the lap, or *the angle formed by the clothes covering the knees of a perſon ſitting, and the trunk of the body,*" Even in this definition of *Gremium*, there is a manifeſt affectation of ſaying ſomething out of the common way; it gives us, however, a definite idea, on which we can lay hold.

Dr. Hill not unfrequently plunges in ſubtleties which Œdipus himſelf would find it hard to unravel. As a proof of this we may quote a part of his explanation of *Continuo* and *Continenter*. They "agree," he ſays, "in denoting the poſſibility that certain events may take place between two ſpecific periods, *which really do not.* But CONTINUO ſuppoſes the ſhortneſs of the interval the cauſe why no event takes place, and, from the unbroken connection, the mind infers the rapid ſucceſſion of one thing, not co-exiſtent with another. Its oppoſition to what was ſaid of 'Continuo,' CONTINENTER ſuppoſes, that between the periods ſpecified or implied, ſome event *has actually taken place*, but that there has been no change of event. That which had begun at the former is underſtood to have continued uninterruptedly, till it ended at the latter." (Pp. 228, 229.)

We ſhall not uſe ourſelves to allow ſuch harſh language as to call this ſolemn and pompous nonſenſe; but no ſpeculation, we think, can be conceived leſs entitled to be ſtyled either valuable or accurate. Not to mention the palpable contradiction contained in the words which we have printed in Italics, what, we aſk, was the idea reſpecting "the poſſibility that certain events may take place, &c." to do here? Simply nothing at all; for the words themſelves imply no ſuch idea. *Continuo* merely ſignifies that one thing ſucceeds *immediately* to another: *Continenter* that ſomething continues *for ſome time.* This is really all that was neceſſary to be ſaid, and all that is ſuggeſted by Dr. Hill's examples: "ignis in aquam conjectus *continuo* extinguitur, biduum *continenter* lapidibus pluit." But ſuch a ſimple expoſition would have no air of profound metaphyſical diſcrimination. The uſe of *continuo* to ſignify, in an argument, the immediate connection of the premiſes and concluſion; a uſe which Dr. Hill (p. 229.) conſiders as "ſeemingly anomalous," is perfectly regular, and requires no elucidation.

In the explanation of ſo plain a word as *Duo*, who would expect ſuch laboured wiſdom as this? "*It denotes that number which is formed by adding unity to itſelf, and which is more than one and leſs than three. It is the firſt ſymbol which marks quantity as divided, and*

and not as one continuous maſs; and the plurality which it announces as commencing may be continued without end." (P. 301.) But, in his diſtinction of *Craſſus* and *Denſus*, our learned author's philoſophy is yet more profound. "They agree," he ſays, "in denoting thickneſs, but differ, as to the manner in which this is effected. The former refers to the groſſneſs of ſingle maſſes, and regards *that dimenſion of ſolids, which is called the third, as coming after their length and breadth. Denſus* (it ought to have been *the latter*, to correſpond to *the former*) again, refers to the thickneſs, which ariſes from the vicinity of particles in fluids, or of the component particles of ſolids, which, taken together, form one whole." (P. 237.) We have farther to obſerve, with regard to theſe words, that they are not rightly brought together as ſynonymes. Dumeſnil's idea was much more correct, who contraſts, with the former term, *pinguis, opimus*, and *obeſus;* with the latter, *confertus, differtus, refertus, ſpiſſus*, and *plenus*.

"DECOLOR and DISCOLOR," ſays Dr. Hill, "agree, in denoting a deviation from ſome ſtandard colour, but differ, according to the extent of this deviation." (P. 276.) This is a curious inſtance of failure in preciſion from the very affectation of being preciſe. That is *decolor* which has loſt its colour, or whoſe original colour has faded. The original colour may, in this caſe, indeed, be called the ſtandard; but *diſcolor* has no reference to a ſtandard colour. It refers, as Dr. Hill himſelf obſerves, "to colours that are completely diſtinct." "*Deeſſe* and *Deficere*," the learned Doctor informs us, "agree, in denoting the abſence of ſome deſirable object; *but the former ſuppoſes only the poſſibility of its paſt or its future exiſtence, while the latter ſuppoſes its certain exiſtence at a paſt time, and its poſſible exiſtence at a future one.*" (P. 279.) We are much miſtaken, if the following explanation, in which there is, certainly, no ſtraining after metaphyſical nicety, do not prove more gratifying to every reader of taſte. "*Deeſſe ſe dit de ce qu'on n'a point;* DEFICERE, *de ce qu'on n'a plus.* Deficere *ſuppoſe qu'on avoit auparavant une choſe, et qu'elle eſt venue à manquer; au lieu que deeſſe exprime ſeulement l'abſence, le beſoin d'une choſe.*" With regard, however, to the regimen of *deficere*, Dumeſnil, which is not often the caſe, is evidently wrong. "On ne dit," he ſays, "*id mihi deficit;* on met toujours l'accuſatif." But the dative is equally proper. "Quum jam amplius horis vi. continenter pugnaretur, ac non ſolum vires, ſed etiam tela, *noſtris deficerent.* &c." Cæſ. De Bel. Gal. III. 5.

In explaining the diſtinctions between *Eſſe, Exiſtere*, and *Fieri*, Dr. Hill writes thus: "The approximations that take place between *Eſſe* and ſuch verbs as thoſe now oppoſed to it, are ſo exceedingly cloſe, that they have eſcaped the eye of ſome grammarians. Theſe have unguardedly called all ſuch, ſubſtantive verbs. *Eſſe* in Latin, at the ſame time, Ειναι in Greek, 'Etre' in French, and 'to be' in Engliſh, though they admit approximations in the reſpective languages, yet have nothing like to themſelves. The four would form a group,

group, each one of which is, with mathematical preciſion, equal to each of the reſt. To ſuppoſe that, *in theſe languages*, there can exiſt a claſs of verbs to which the term 'ſubſtantive' is applicable, implies a looſeneſs of conception, of which grammarians ſhould be aſhamed." (Pp. 322, 323.) The grammarian, however, who expreſſes himſelf in this manner has no great right, we think, to complain of "looſeneſs of conception" in others. Inſtead of "in theſe languages," accuracy of thought would have led our author to ſubſtitute "in any language;" for he is not arguing from the genius of the Latin, Greek, French, or Engliſh, as oppoſed to other languages, but from the nature of things, which remains the ſame, whatever language be ſpoken.

Dr. Hill's inconſiſtency is ſometimes ſo glaring that it quite confounds us. "*Ferus*," he ſays, "ALWAYS implies that the animal, marked by it, enjoys his liberty uncontrouled, and ſhews a diſpoſition *to prey upon others*." (P. 369.) Yet, in the very next ſentence, we are told that this diſpoſition is NOT THE UNIVERSAL CONCOMITANT of the quality expreſſed by *Ferus*, as ſome animals, even in their wild ſtate, are timid and harmleſs, and, being tamed, only become more familiar with man, whom they naturally diſtruſt." In our author's article on *jucundus*, *gratus*, *gratioſus*, *Amænus*, we find theſe remarks:

"Cicero, wiſhing to receive, from his friend Atticus, information upon a ſubject that was intereſting, though not agreeable, unfolds the difference between 'jucundus' and *gratus* thus: 'Hæc res quemadmodum ceciderit, et tota res quo loco ſit, velim ad me ſcribas. Nam iſta veritas, etiamſi 'jucunda' non eſt, mihi tamen *grata* eſt.' *Ep. ad. Att.* 52. The political events, that were here to be the ſubject of intelligence, are ſaid to be *the contrary* of what is denoted by 'jucundus;' but the act of giving the intelligence was intreated by means of *gratus*, as agreeable, and as deſerving the grateful acknowledgements of Cicero to his friend." (P. 476.)

Who would expect a ſentence immediately to follow, which flatly contradicts the quotation from Cicero? Yet ſo it is: "It is to be obſerved," ſays our author, "that nothing can be ſaid to be *gratum* that is not in a certain degree 'jucundum." Some of his obſervations on *gratioſus* appear not to be much more exact. The "agreeableneſs," we are told, "of the man who is *gratioſus is not*, like that implied in 'jucundus,' *the phyſical effect of amiable qualities* operating upon the obſerver, but the conſequence of addreſs ſkilfully exerted, either by the agent himſelf, or by another in his behalf." (P. 477.) The following aſſertion is immediately added: "It is, in fact, *the perſonal qualities that deſerve favour*, that render a man *gratioſus*, whether reported by thoſe to whom they are known, or exhibited by himſelf." If, in this place, the writer's conceptions were clear, he has been very unſucceſsful in expreſſing them intelligibly.

But ſtriking as theſe inconſiſtencies may ſeem, they are nothing to the

the following, which are really so grofs that it would not, we think, be very eafy to match them. " *In early times*, it (the villa) was the *conftant abode* of the 'villicus' ONLY, who had the management of the farm upon which it ftood. 'Villicus appellatus a *villa*, quod ab eo in eam convehantur fructus, et evehantur cum veneunt.' VARR. *R. R.* 1. 2. 14. The proprietor of the farm, or one capable of conducting the bufinefs of it, appears ALSO to have, *in ancient times, refided* CONSTANTLY *in the villa.*" (P. 763.) We are told that *negare*, " in its primitive fenfe, denotes nothing more than the negation of a propofition, which, confiftently with truth cannot be affirmed. By means of it, the fpeaker denies the exiftence of a fuppofed fact, *the contrary of which muft neceffarily exift*, and *he* gives that information to the hearer, which is, in *his* apprehenfion, conftent with truth, and muft be agreeable to *him*, unlefs *he* wifhes to be deceived." (P. 536.) To pafs over the bad writing of this laft fentence, difplayed in the confufed application of the pronouns to different perfons, the philofophy of it is falfe, for nothing can be more falfe than that " the contrary of what is denied muft neceffarily exift." Accordingly the author, if we underftand him, completely contradicts the aflertion in the very next page. " *Negare*," he fays, " reaches only to the expreffion, not to the juftice or the injuftice, with which the thing is uttered." We believe that he here employs the words *juftice* and *injuftice* for *truth* and *falfehood;* but the fact is accurately as he has ftated it. Laftly, on this head; " *Magnitudo* and *Majeftas* agree," we are informed, " in denoting greatnefs; but the one has a ftronger reference to this greatnefs, *as abfolute*; and the other to it as *comparative.*" (P. 500.) This, we think, is correct. Yet in the very next article, which treats of *magnus, ingens, amplus*, and *procerus*, we meet with this very unexpected information: " The *notion of abfolute magnitude*, it muft be obferved, *is inconceivable*," (p. 502.) " *utrum horum*," fay we.

In this article our ingenious author has fome remarks on *ingens*, which deferve to be attended to. " INGENS," he fays, " differs from 'magnus,' in denoting greatnefs, that is preternatural, and is unexampled in the claffs of objects to which that fpecified belongs." (P. 502.) The firft part of this aflertion is, we conceive, correct; with refpect to the fecond part, it is obviouflly falfe. The learned profeffor, however, is clear that " the fuperiority of that denominated *ingens* is fo decided, as to eclipfe the reft that participate in its nature. He even goes fo far as to fay the eflence of *hugenefs* depends on there being *nothing in nature* in which the quality that it is made to denominate is to be found in a fuperior degree." (P. 503.) He accordingly contends that it is abfurd to give *ingens* either a comparative or fuperlative degree; and that, " when Virgil ftyles Æneas 'fama *ingens* a *ingentior* armis,' his doing fo muft be confidered as a poetical licence, fuch as that of Milton, fpeaking of the Leviathan, '*Hugeft* of living creatures, &c." We cannot, however, on the prefent occafion, compliment Dr. Hill on the accuracy of his conceptions; nor, are

we willing to allow that Virgil and Milton were men likely to be led, by poetical licence, into manifeſt abſurdity. The truth is, that Dr. Hill has entirely miſtaken the meaning of *ingens*. It ſignifies, indeed, that the object exceeds the common ſtandard of its ſpecies; but, not at all, that there is "nothing in nature in which the quality that it is made to denominate is to be found in a ſuperior degree." *A* may exceed the common ſtature of men; yet *B* may exceed it in a greater degree; and *C* moſt of all. *A* is, therefore, *ingens; B ingentior*, and *C ingentiſſimus*. The learned Profeſſor appears alſo to have miſunderſtood the expreſſion of Virgil; for the poet does not ſay that Æneas was *ingentior*, compared with any other man, but only that he was greater in arms than in fame. But had Virgil meant to ſtate a compariſon between Œneas and Turnus, he might have ſaid, with ſtrict philoſophical truth, that the latter was *ingens*, though the former was *ingentior, armis*. They were both ſuperior to common warriors; but the former was more ſo than the latter.

From a paſſage in the learned profeſſor's preface we are led to conclude that he views his analyſis of the Latin prepoſitions with great complacency. "*Along*," he ſays, "with the ſynonymes of the Latin language, an attempt has been made to explain its PREPOSITIONS, in the order in which they occur in the arrangements. If theſe, the moſt ſubtle of the parts of ſpeech, require deep attention in a ſimple ſtate, much more do they require it when compounded. In this laſt capacity, they modify the term, to which they are prefixed, with all the variety of power belonging to each of them when apart. Their primary relations, holding as to matter in ſpace, muſt be made by analogy to explain relations, from which the idea of ſpace is excluded. Without analyzing prepoſitions, ſynonymes can never be underſtood; as the force of the contraſted term often reſts upon that, given or witheld by what is made to coaleſce with it." (Pref. p. xiii.) To this important part, therefore, of the profeſſor's ſubject we ſhall, in our next number, pay due attention.

(To be continued.)

Account of the Life of James Beattie, late Profeſſor of Moral Philoſophy at Aberdeen. One vol. 12mo. By Alexander Bower. 230 pages. Price 5s. Baldwins. 1804.

THE life of a literary man, requires for its uſeful elucidation, the pen of a writer well verſed in the ſpecies of literature, for which the ſubject was known. Hence Dugald Stewart was ſo peculiarly qualified for being the biographer of Reid, as we before remarked in reviewing that article. Mr. Bower appears to have received a claſſical education; and to have made good progreſs in other branches of knowledge; but we do not find that extent and depth of metaphyſical, moral, or theological ſcience, which are neceſſary to trace the genius of Beattie through its efforts in ſupport of truth, virtue, and religion. To

To form a juſt eſtimate of the works of Beattie, it is neceſſary to review what Hume had done; what had been done in oppoſition to him, by Reid, and others: what remained for Beattie to perform, what he did perform; and how. This exhibition is not attempted by Mr. Bower; nevertheleſs, though by no means a maſterly production, this is a plain and uſeful ſtatement of facts worthy of record.

James Beattie was born in November 1735, at Laurence-kirk, in the county of Kincardine. His father was a farmer, of conſiderable abilities, with ſome talent for poetry. Dying when James was only ſeven years old, he left his family in narrow circumſtances. His eldeſt ſon, however, David, only eighteen years of age, acted as a father to the family; and through his kindneſs to James was that youth able to receive a claſſical education; ſo that the world is indebted to David Beattie, the farmer, for all the pleaſure and inſtruction which it has derived from James Beattie, the poet and philoſopher. James was bred at the village ſchool, and under Mr. James Milne, a very capital teacher, and made very rapid progreſs; and beſides his claſſical attainments, exhibited promiſing ſpecimens of a poetic genius. His generous brother, though he could ill afford it, reſolved to ſend James to the Univerſity. To Aberdeen he repaired at fourteen years of age, and ſoon diſtinguiſhed himſelf as the beſt ſcholar of his claſs. His character roſe as he advanced in years; and when in 1753, he took his degree, he was diſtinguiſhed beyond any of his contemporaries, for literary attainments; he, however, had made little progreſs in mathematics, and through life never deeply entered into that ſcience. In this part of the narrative our author gives an accurate account of the plan of academical ſtudy at Aberdeen. He alſo mentions the different profeſſors of that time, with a particularity of detail, that may be intereſting at Aberdeen, where they may have obtained a traditionary celebrity; but is not intereſting to the public, to which many of their names are unknown.

Having left college, Mr. Beattie, to lighten his brother's burthen, undertook the charge of the village ſchool at Fordoun; and while he moſt faithfully and ably performed his duty as a preceptor, he found time to advance rapidly in his literary courſe. In this part of the narrative our author introduces the ſtate of parochial ſchools in Scotland at that period, and their effect in facilitating the acquiſition of learning at a ſmall expence. At this time Beattie frequently contributed to the Scotch Magazine, a publication of high eſtimation. He now formed acquaintance with various gentlemen then his ſuperiors, but now forgotten, while he is and always will be remembered. From Fordoun Beattie was promoted to be maſter of the Grammar School at Aberdeen. There he had the command of the college library, and every means of extending his literary attainments, and alſo of cultivating intimacy with lettered men. He often had publiſhed detached poems: in 1761, he publiſhed an octavo volume of poetry. About this time he was made Profeſſor of Moral Philoſophy. In 1764 he wrote his Eſſay on laughter and ludicrous compoſition.

Within a few years about this period were compoſed all his principal works, though not publiſhed till ſome time afterwards. In 1766, he married Miſs Dun, daughter of Dr. Dun, his predeceſſor in the ſchool of Aberdeen. Our author gives a very ſhort account of Beattie's Eſſay on Truth. He now was very high in literary reputation. In 1768, he publiſhed his Minſtrel, which our author praiſes more highly than it is *now* praiſed by the world.

December 12, 1770, he was made Doctor of Laws. In 1771, he viſited the Metropolis, was introduced to Lord Mansfield, and other eminent men; and at their head to Dr. Johnſon. In 1773 he again viſited London, was introduced to the Sovereign, and very graciouſly received. In 1777 he publiſhed his Eſſay on Memory and Imagination. Some years after, he occaſionally contributed to the *Mirror*, a periodical paper publiſhed at Edinburgh. In 1783 he publiſhed his Eſſay on the Theory of Language; and ſoon after turned his attention to the evidences of the Chriſtian Religion. In 1784 he ſhewed the firſt ſketch of this work to Dr. Porteus, then Biſhop of Cheſter; but did not publiſh it till 1790. Soon after he publiſhed his Elements of Moral Science. About this time he loſt his eldeſt ſon, a youth of high promiſe; and ſome years after, his ſecond ſon, who was ſtill abler than his brother. Theſe calamities embittered the laſt years of Dr. Beattie; and his health, never good, was thereby impaired. He now entirely ſequeſtered himſelf from ſociety; for three years he conſtantly kept the houſe, and during a great part of that time was confined to his bed: on the 18th of Auguſt he breathed his laſt.

The biographer, in attempting a character of his hero, rather enumerates conſtituents, than preſents a view, or exhibits an eſtimate. Thoſe who were unacquainted with Dr. Beattie's works, may learn from Mr. Bower, how many books he wrote, and what were his favourite ſtudies; but from Mr. Bower cannot learn WHAT DR. BEATTIE WAS. We wiſh Mr. Dugald Stewart would undertake the intellectual picture of Dr. Beattie; although, we apprehend, he will not rate that author ſo very highly as Mr. Bower rates him. Beattie was a popular writer, with lively, though diffuſe eloquence, but too looſe and declamatory for philoſophical writing; in logical accuracy, and metaphyſical depth, he is far inferior to Reid; in ſound, vigorous, and profound reflexion, in comprehenſiveneſs of underſtanding, extent of views, and grandeur of ſentiment, he is very far inferior to Ferguſſon. His biographer, therefore, is injudicious in comparing him to thoſe eminent ſages.

On the whole, this ſpecimen of biography is a work of very ſecondary merit, nevertheleſs it is an uſeful publication as a record of facts worthy of being known.

Medical

Medical Sketches of the Expedition to Egypt. By James M'Gregor, Esq. 1 vol. Pp. 240. 8vo. 7s. 1804.

OF travels in Egypt, of journals, and of accounts of the Expedition to that country, the public has had a ſufficiency both from French and from Engliſh writers. From the Medicin en chœf of the French Army, we have likewiſe had a very copious hiſtory of the health of the French army in Egypt, and of the prevailing diſeaſes of that country. From other individuals of that army, the public has likewiſe had ſeparate treatiſes on the Plague, the Opthalmia, the Dyſentery, and of other diſeaſes, as they made their appearance in the French army in Egypt. If we except two ſhort treatiſes, the one on opthalmia, and the other on diarrhœa, given by the ſurgeons as they appeared in ſingle regiments of the Britiſh army in Egypt, the public has as yet ſeen nothing from any Engliſhman on the diſeaſes of Egypt. In the non-appearance of any ſuch account, we are aſſured the public will participate in the diſappointment which we have experienced. With their army to Egypt the Britiſh nation ſent a very numerous medical ſtaff, and of that ſtaff, we muſt think, that ſeveral were qualified to give the medical hiſtory of our memorable expedition: and to give ſatisfactory accounts of the plague and the other diſeaſes which proved ſo fatal to our brave countrymen there.

In the earlier ages, we have from the ancients, very diſtinct accounts of the diſeaſes, of the ſoil, and of the climate of Egypt. In a philoſophical as well as in a phyſical view, after ſuch a lapſe of years, after ſo many ſingular revolutions as this renowned country has undergone, it would be a ſubject worthy of enquiry, what changes have been effected in the phyſical conſtitution of the country, what in its diſeaſes. As nations change from a rude to a civilized ſtate, doubtleſs their diſeaſes are both increaſed and conſiderably changed. The diſeaſes of man are both increaſed in number, and different in kind in civilized ſociety, from what they were while he was in the hunter or ſhepherd ſtate.

We ſtill hope for the medical hiſtory of our Egyptian army, and ſhall expect a finiſhed account when it does appear. In the mean time, we are here preſented with a medical hiſtory of the army, which, under General Baird, came from India to co-operate with the Britiſh army in Egypt. This account is by the author Mr. M'Gregor, who had the ſuperintendance of the medical department of the Indian army modeſtly termed Sketches. In a Preface, he tells us, that he laboured under many diſadvantages, and profeſſes to give only ſketches or memoirs, which, he ſays, he hopes will be uſeful to the general hiſtorian of the diſeaſes of Egypt and of the Britiſh army.

He pays a very liberal but juſt tribute to the medical affairs of the Indian army, who as he ſays, "had the poſt of honour in Egypt," for, to their regret, the army arrived too late to ſhare "in any dangers excepting ſuch as aroſe from the diſeaſes of the country."

The author divides his book into three parts. 1. The Medical

Journal of the Expedition; 2. The Cauſes of the Diſeaſes; and 3. The Hiſtory of the Diſeaſes.

The firſt part is rendered needleſsly tedious, by a minute account of the weather; all this ought to have been condenſed into a table. It appears, that the Indian army conſiſting of about 8000 men from different parts of India, landed at Koſſier on the Weſtern coaſt of the Red Sea; and in traverſing the deſart, that they nearly followed Mr. Bruce's rout. From Ghenné in Upper Egypt, the army was tranſported in boats to Cairo, Roſetta, and Alexandria. It was at Roſetta that the plague firſt broke out: of its appearance, and hiſtory thereafter, we have a minute and ſufficiently ſatisfactory account.

In his ſecond diviſion or part, Mr. M'Gregor is not at all clear on the cauſes of the ſickneſs which prevailed in the army: this part is by no means ſatisfactory. From every deſcription of Egypt which we have ſeen, we would be led to expect a fever there which would remit or intermit. He wiſhes with theſe to connect the plague, particularly in its cauſes, and in ſome of its ſymptoms. We do not well underſtand what he would be at, nor does he himſelf appear at all clear in his ideas on this ſubject; at any rate, if he has diſtinct ideas on it, he has been ſingularly unſucceſsful in his expreſſion of them. That this diſeaſe is imported into Egypt, and that it is communicated by contagion, he ſeems to have formed a decided opinion; but ſtill he wiſhes to think it the ſame as the remittant fever, and the fever which he deſcribes as prevailing over India, and which he acknowledges is never contagious.

The ſtate of health in which the Indian army continued for half a year on ſhip-board is very properly held up to public attention, and the cauſes aſſigned are well worthy the particular conſideration of the planners of our expeditions, and of our Boards at home.

The principal part of the laſt diviſion is occupied with the plague, opthalmia, and dyſentery. The firſt of theſe diſeaſes will moſt intereſt the majority of readers. As beſt illuſtrating the ſymptoms, the caſes of ſix of the ſurgeons are deſcribed, who wrote accurately every thing which they felt. We ſhall extract one of theſe, which we think will particularly intereſt; it is that of Dr. Whyte, of whom the public has heard ſo much.

"Dr. Whyte entered the peſt-houſe at El Hammed on the evening of the 2nd of January, 1802. In a letter of that date he writes to me, 'I juſt now inoculated myſelf, by friction, with bubonic matter on the left thigh.' On the 3d, he ſays, 'I have this morning inoculated myſelf, by inciſion, on the right fore-arm.' Mr. Rice, then doing duty at the peſt-houſe at El Hammed, gives the whole of the caſe. In a letter of the 3d of January, he writes to me, 'Dr. Whyte came here laſt night; ſoon after he came in, he rubbed ſome matter from the bubo of a woman on the inſide of his thighs. The next morning, he inoculated himſelf in the wriſt with a lancet, with matter taken from the running bubo of a Sepoy, he appears now very

very well.' In ſubſequent letters, Mr. Rice ſays, 'that Dr. Whyte continued in good health on the 5th, and all day on the 6th, till the evening, when he was attacked with rigors and other febrile ſymptoms. He ſaid himſelf, that it was the attack of an intermittant; and it bore a great reſemblance to it. After ſweating profuſely, he was better in the morning of the 7th, but in the afternoon the ſhivering returned; and, after it had continued thirty minutes, a ſevere hot ſtage came on, then a profuſe ſweating followed; but with it, much affection of the head, tremor of the limbs, particularly of the upper extremities, tongue black and dry, ſkin hot, pulſe full, hard, and irregular, thirſt great, proſtration of ſtrength, and anxiety. His head was the only place that he complained of, and it ſeemed to be the principal ſeat of his diſeaſe; he ſtill perſiſted that the diſeaſe was not the plague; he would not allow his groin or arm pits to be examined, and he refuſed all medical aſſiſtance. He died very delirious on the afternoon of the 9th."

This caſe is of ſingular value, as being perhaps the only one in record which commences from the period of inoculation, or from the firſt expoſure to the peſtilential contagion. Its value, however, is much leſſoned from the deſultory way in which it is given. Being in poſſeſſion of Dr. Whyte's letters on his own caſe, and the ſubſequent correſpondence of Mr. Rice, the author ought to have given ſome ſatisfactory information; we believe it would have formed not the leaſt valuable information of his volume.

Had Mr. M's. reading been more extenſive, he would not have regarded as new or extraordinary this diſeaſe aſſuming a remittant form, nor thought the application of mercury *a diſcovery*. In the treatment the author relies moſt on this mineral, and what he calls *the new remedies*; particularly the nitric acid, a remedy to which he appears partial in a variety of diſeaſes. Mr. M. is newly arrived from India; we fancy that a reſidence in this country, and an intercourſe with his profeſſional brethren, will convince him, that, like ſome of the phyſicians here, he, in his zeal, has expected and promiſed too much from the "new remedies." In the account given of the opthalmia of Egypt we have little here that other accounts did not give us. By deciſive teſtimony he confirms the ſtatements of Meſſrs. Power and Edmonſtone of the diſeaſe being communicated by contagion. In the cauſes, ſymptoms, and cure, we obſerve only a repetition of former accounts. Some uſeful hints for prevention are offered. Mr. M'Gregor's extenſive acquaintance in the four quarters of the world has enabled him to offer ſome good general remarks on fever. He finds a great reſemblance between fever, as he has ſeen it in the Eaſt and in the Weſt Indies; and he is inclined to think that the fever ſeen in different quarters between the tropics is eſſentially the ſame. From the ſtatements of his correſpondents we have accounts of fevers on the Malabar and Coromandel coaſt, in Calcutta, Bombay, Ceylon, Batavia, and China. The few general remarks on meſſatiles we conſider of value. In dyſentery Mr. M's. experience appears to have been

ample; but all the world has long known, that in cases of any standing the mercurial remedies were the most efficacious.

The volume concludes with some remarks on the Guinea worm and on tetanus; in both diseases, Mr. M's. extensive experience has afforded him opportunity of differing from writers in general. From evidence, that certainly is not slight, he conjectures, that the Guinea worm is communicated by contagion, somewhat in the manner that the itch is; and he has found the treatment by the hot bath the most successful in tetanus, both in the West Indies and in the East.

In a note to this volume, an allusion is made to a circumstance, which will interest any reader, medical, as well as others. Mr. M. informs us OF HIS HAVING FREQUENTLY SEEN AND CONVERSED WITH A FRENCH APOTHECARY WHOM BUONAPARTE ORDERED TO POISON THE WOUNDED SICK AT ACRE; AND THAT HE HAD OFTEN HEARD HIM MENTION THE SUBJECT. This is mentioned by Mr. M. as a business well and generally known in the Indian army, and we have heard that the Pharmacian in Chief is a man of probity—pity he should not be more so than the Emperor of the Gauls. We expect to hear no farther cavilling at Sir Robert Wilson's account; a statement which is now confirmed by Dr. Waitman and every other traveller who has been in that country, though petulantly objected to by these British friends of the Corsican usurper.

POLITICS.

No Gun-Boats, or no Peace! A Letter from Me to Myself. By the Rev. Joshua Larwood. 8vo. Pp. 40. 1s. Stockdale. 1804.

THE destruction of Buonaparté's flotilla, either by "*battle* or by *compact*," is a point more strongly insisted on in this pamphlet, than we have before seen it in any other work. "While this flotilla exists," observes the author, "there is no safety from invasion, no security from alarm, no shelter from expense;" and we perfectly agree with him, that it "must be blown from the bosom of the ocean by British cannonade, or blasted in its own ports from the face of creation by the omnipotence of *Convention*."

"In former treaties of peace," says Mr. Larwood, "it has been usual to establish on each side of the disarming powers, reciprocal and respectable Commissioners to superintend and effectuate the mutual disarmament. Heretofore such commissions were limited to dismantling *ships of the line*; but, with the enemy's ships of the line, the danger does not *now* rest: a *gun-boat*, as an unit of an *armada* of gun-boats, is an object of more insufferable offence, than La Ville de Paris of three decks; an assassin dwarf, destined and dispositioned for midnight mischief and murder, is more perilous to the safety and sanctity of repose, than the huge noon-of-day giant, caparisoned for undissembled field of battle contest. Let England unpoignard her [the French] dwarf assassins, and she is confident against the giants of the world in arms!"

Our author is of opinion, that "were our enterprizing forces in the West

Weſt Indies to continue their valorous and victorious career, and be as completely and ultimately ſucceſsful as their gallant brethren in the Eaſt; were they to annex all the territories of France and the Batavian ſtates to our country by conqueſt, it" would be "better, far better, that Britain ſhould return them all at a peace without an equivalent, or the ſhadow of a ſhade of an equivalent, without even the redemption of any thing loſt in the courſe and caſualties of war;" it would be better "to give all, relinquiſh all, recover nothing, than ſuffer their gun-boats to remain in even an unruddered, unmaſted, unordinanced, exiſtence."—Scuttling, ſwamping, even *burning* will not do, "unleſs by burning is meant to be implied the drawing them up high and dry upon the beach and reducing them to aſhes."

Mr. Larwood, from the various grounds of argument which he adduces, advances a ſtrong declaration, that "the Engliſh miniſter, (be he who he may for the moment,) who ſhall dare to acquieſce in the enemy's propoſitions for peace, without the previous ſtipulation of *delenda eſt flotilla*,, is the decided and deſtructive foe to his country, and ought to *loſe his head!*"—"It might here," ſays he, "be obſerved by any perſon more ſceptical than patriotic, '*ſuppoſe the enemy will not accede to your demand.*'—The anſwer is ſhort, but neceſſary; '*then we will not make peace!*'"

In addition to the ſtrength of argument, and the clearneſs of demonſtration, which our author exhibits, his talent for humour entitles him to conſiderable praiſe. Having obſerved, that "the ancient government of France uniformly indulged the fond wiſh for the invaſion and ruin of our iſlands;" and that "the preſent government means to carry into fatal effect what its predeceſſors only viewed in diſtant perſpective," he ſays:

"The *flotilla of Boulogne* is the grand, and, indeed, the ſole axis on which this mighty project revolves; what a more limited power impelled them [the ancient government of France] to cheriſh, in the ſecret receſs of boſom contemplation, extended conqueſt: *What Monsieur l'Eveque d'Autun* only contemplated in England and in peace, as a remote probability, the uncaſſocked prelate, in his now re-laymaned miniſterial capacity, and by virtue of his and his maſter's Boulogne flotilla, conſiders as a *done thing:* What *Monsieur l'Eveque d'Autun* only dreamed about as a deſirable and diſtant accompliſhment, *le Citoyen Taleyrand Perigord*, Sans Culottes, Secretary of State, jacobin, republican, and definitively, monarchical Cameleon, *now* views as *la gageure gagnée*, not as a viſionary problematical adventure, but as an indiſputable and inevitable conqueſt. Of this precious event, although the Proteus continues to dream in his Anti-Anglian ſlumbers, he, nevertheleſs, in his pillow-lucubrations, cheriſhes the vaſt and delightful idea, while feaſting his celebrated optics upon the ſleeping charms of *la Citoyenne Taleyrand;* and, as la Citoyenne has ſacriligiouſly plundered the Church of its valuable treaſure, in the perſon of her now irreverend ſpouſe, and has careſſed him to the ſurrender of his celibacy for the hymeneal chain, ſo would the benedict prieſt glory to cajole, or to conquer us *ſhopkeepers* into the barter of our liberties for Buonaparté's bloody bleſſings, and the ſacrifice of our conſtitution for the fetters of France."

A calm and diſpaſſionate Address to Sir Francis Burdett, Bart. pointing out to him the Causes of his defeat at the late Election of a Member to repreſent the County of Middleſex. By an Independent Freeholder. 8vo. Pp. 30. 1s. Rivingtons. 1804.

THIS addreſs, which is juſtly denominated "calm and diſpaſſionate," will,

will, we ſuſpect, produce but little effect on the mind of the demagogue to whom it is addreſſed. It exhibits a brief view of his public conduct, which is truly conſidered as the cauſe of his diſappointment; and pays a tribute of applauſe to the *private* conduct of the Baronet, which, if one-half that we have heard be true, is certainly not very well deſerved. That, however, is a ſubject which it is foreign from our purpoſe to diſcuſs. Sir Francis is here charged with having become an advocate for the French revolution, "*a member of the Correſponding Society*," the aſſociate of traitors, and the friend of the criminal and the diſaffected.

On the buſineſs of the meeting, Mr. Sheridan's conduct is contraſted with the Baronet's, and an eulogy is pronounced on the former, which we are very far indeed from believing to be juſt. Mr. Sheridan, we conſider as a political mountebank, fond of flattery, and eager to catch popularity with *any bait*. And to this diſpoſition we incline to impute thoſe effuſions of loyalty which have occaſionally eſcaped him, and which become him almoſt as well as profeſſions of piety from the Rev. John Horne Tooke, Eſq. or declarations of attachment to the conſtitution by Sir Francis Burdett, Bart. and the gang at his heels, on the Huſtings at Brentford, and at the orgies at the Crown and Anchor. Mr. Cobbett, we have ever thought, rendered a public ſervice, by placing the *Protean* principles of Mr. Sheridan in a proper point of view; and in a diſcuſſion on the Middleſex election, which will be found at the end of our preſent Number, we ſhall exhibit one additional trait, which will give the finiſhing ſtroke to his portrait, and remove all doubts from the public mind, as to the degree of credit to which any profeſſions of his are entitled.

In this tract are ſome charges of a ſerious nature, which any other man than Sir Francis Burdett would feel himſelf called upon to *anſwer*; but Sir Francis will call them calumnies, and prudently conſider them as beneath his notice. It is certainly the eaſieſt way of anſwering what cannot be confuted.

A full account of the Proceedings at the Middlesex Election, including the Speeches at the close of each day's poll. To which is added copies of the different Electioneering Squibs, Songs, Speeches, &c. issued by several Partisans for Sir Francis Burdett and Mr. Mainwaring junior, at the Middlesex Election, 1804. 8vo. Pp. 32. 6d. Springsfurth. 1804.

SIXPENNYWORTH of ſeditious traſh, and low ſcurrility, gleaned from the St. Giles's Committee, in the intereſt of the jacobin candidate, with a portrait prefixed, which might ſerve as well for Jack Shepherd, Jonathan Wild, or Sixteen-String Jack, as for Sir Francis Burdett.

POETRY.

Terrible Tractoration!! A Poetical Petition against Galvanising Trumpery, and the Perkinistic Institution. In Four Cantos. Most respectfully addressed to the Royal College of Physicians. By Chriſtopher Cauſtic, M. D. L. L. D. A. S. S. Fellow of the Royal College of Phyſicians, Aberdeen; and Honorary Member of no leſs than Nineteen very learned Societies. Second Edition, with great Additions: Small 8vo. 4s. 6d. Pp. 186. Hurſt.

FOR a general character of this ingenious and truly humorous poem, we muſt refer our readers to Vol. xiv. p. 416, of our *Review*. The preſent edition

edition is not merely a reprint of the former, but contains more than double its quantity of matter; and, to its increaſed bulk, its value bears a due proportion.

The following ludicrous animadverſion on the goſſamery theories of the philoſophiſtic Darwin, now forming a part of the third canto, are entitled to much praiſe; and, though the extract is ſomewhat longer than we could wiſh, we are confident that our readers will derive much gratification from peruſing it.

" Folks ought to die juſt when God pleaſes;
But moſt of all the dirty poor,
Who make, quoth Darwin, good manure *.

" That when the Ruſſians logger-headed,
Were killed by Frenchmen, ever dreaded,
Darwin rejoic'd, the filthy creatures
Would ſerve for ſtock to make muſquitoes †.

" And

" * Who make, quoth Darwin, good manure.

" Beſides the advantage of ſhewing how reverently this great philoſopher and philanthropiſt could ſpeak of religion, I am ſure I ſhall render an eſſential ſervice to agriculturiſts, by adducing the following quotation. I bring it forward the more readily, as I find the Board of Agriculture have been ſo negligent of the intereſt of that noble art, as not yet to have recommended the univerſal adoption of this meaſure.

'There ſhould be no burial-places in churches, or church-yards, *where the monuments of departed ſinners ſhoulder God's altar*, and pollute his holy places with dead men's bones. But proper burial-places ſhould be conſecrated out of towns, and divided into two compartments, the earth from one of which, ſaturated with animal decompoſition, ſhould be taken away once in ten or twenty years, *for the purpoſes of agriculture*, and ſand or clay, or leſs fertile ſoil, brought into its place.' *Darwin's Phytologia, p.* 242.

" † Would ſerve for ſtock to make muſquitoes.

" Among other ſpeculations alſo in the cauſe of humanity, bequeathed us by *this friend of man*, are the following, which will ſerve to prove a great conſolation to thoſe who have fooliſhly ſuppoſed that the blood-ſhed and devaſtation, produced by war, were circumſtances which ought to be lamented.

" Theſe remarks are publiſhed by Dr. Darwin, as written under his own obſervations in the manuſcript of his book, by a '*philoſophical* friend,' whom he left in his library. It is ſuppoſed, however, that the Doctor wrote them himſelf. At leaſt, the ſentiments have his ſanction. 'It conſoles me to find, as I contemplate the whole of organized nature, that it is not in the power of any one perſonage, whether ſtateſman or hero, to produce by his ill-employed activity, ſo much miſery as might have been ſuppoſed. Thus if a Ruſſian army, in theſe inſane times, after having endured a laborious march of many hundred miles, is deſtroyed by a French army in defence of their republic, what has happened? Forty thouſand human creatures, dragged from their houſes and connexions, ceaſe to exiſt, and have *manured* the *earth*; but the quantity of organized matter, of which they were compoſed,

" And alſo urges, with propriety,
That war's no evil in ſociety;
But has a charming operation,
To check exceſs of population.

" Superfluous myriads, from the earth,'
Are ſwept by peſtilence and dearth;*
Which drive his philoſophic plan on,
As well as blunderbuſs, or cannon.

" That

---

poſed, preſently revives in the forms of millions of microſcopic animals, vegetables, and inſects, and afterwards of quadrupeds and men, *the ſum of whoſe happiness is, perhaps, greater than that of the harrassed soldiers by whose destruction they have gained their existence.* Is not this a conſoling idea to a mind of univerſal ſympathy? I fear you will think me a miſanthrope, but I aſſure you a contrary ſenſation dwells in my boſom; and though I commiſerate the evils of all organized beings, 'Homo, ſum, humani nihil a me alienum puto."

Phytologia, p. 558.

" * Are ſwept by peſtilence and dearth.

" Laſt words of Dr. Darwin.

" I take no ſmall credit to myſelf, for being one of the firſt to bring into notice the lateſt and moſt ſublime of this ſublime philoſopher's ſublime ſpeculations. The fountain from which this radiant ſtream of illumination flows is denominated among bookſellers, 'THE TEMPLE OF NATURE.'

" To paint all the writer's conceptions of the manſion of that old lady, and her own moſt ſingular qualifications, would be a taſk even beyond the abilities of a Cauſtic. Mr. Fuſeli, however, has *painted his conceptions* on the occaſion which, in one of his deſigns, appear, ſo far as I can comprehend him, to be ſimply theſe. In his frontiſpiece to the work, he repreſents one beautiful lady pointing at, or rather fumbling about, (ſomewhat indecently I muſt confeſs), a *middle* or *third* breaſt of another beautiful lady, whom I ſuppoſe to be Dame Nature,

" Than which there's nothing can be apter
To fill philoſophers with rapture.

" (Your Worſhip will excuſe my burſting into poetry, for the idea ſets all my inſides into ſuch a della cruscan-like ferment, that I ſhould certainly have ſplit open, had it not thus overflowed). This *third* breaſt I take to be the painter's emblem of the diſcoveries of Dr. Darwin—implying that their exiſtence is as evident, as that a woman has three breaſts. But, not to digreſs, the Doctor aſcertains that

" Human progenies if unreſtrain'd,
By climate friended, and by food ſuſtain'd,
O'er ſeas and ſoils prolific hordes would ſpread,
E'er long, and deluge their terraqueous bed:
But war and peſtilence, diſeaſe and dearth
Sweep the ſuperfluous myriads from the earth.

TEMPLE OF NATURE. CANTO IV.

" Some

" That, in this world's great ſlaughter-houſe,
Not only ſheep, and calves, and cows,
But ' man erect, with thought elate,'
Muſt ' duck' to death his ſtubborn pate.*

" That in ſaid butcher's ſhop, the weakeſt
Should always be ' killed off' the quickeſt,
Becauſe Dame Nature gave the ſtrongeſt
The *right* and *power* to live the longeſt.

" That ſince ' to die is but to ſleep,'†
And poor diſeas'd are ſcabby ſheep,
That none need care a ſingle button
If we ſhould make them all dead mutton.

" That death is but a trivial thing,
Becauſe a toadſtool, or a king,

" Some *un*philoſophical theoriſts have fooliſhly ſuppoſed that this ſweeping plan of Dr. Darwin, which that philoſopher appears to have introduced, leſt ' prolic hordes' ſhould ' deluge their terraqueous beds,' might as well be deferred till a few of the ' *ſuperfluous*' acres on the earth's ſurface were reduced to a ſtate of cultivation. I ſhould adviſe to employ theſe ſupernumeraries in navigating polar ices within the tropics, as recommended by the Doctor in the ' *Botanic Garden*,' were I not apprehenſive leſt I ſhould thereby, in ſome meaſure, deſtroy the operation of Saint Pierre's Tides.

" * Muſt ' duck' to death his ſtubborn pate.

" More laſt words of Dr. Darwin.

' The brow of man erect, with thought elate,
Ducks to the mandate of reſiſtleſs fate.'
Temple of Nature. Canto IV.

" I have exhibited this couplet at all the aſſemblages of my poetiſing brethren in Grub-ſtreet and St. Giles's, not omitting the inhabitants of the ' Wit's Corner' at the Chapter Coffee-houſe, the elevated tenants of the Cyder Cellar in Maiden-lane, and Col. Hanger's ' Knights of the Round Table,' all of whom agree in acknowledging the elegance and correctness of the metaphor, and that its beauties are ſo tranſcendantly exquiſite, and beyond the ken of mortal eye, as to be perfectly incomprehenſible."

" † That ſince ' to die is but to ſleep.'

' Long o'er the wrecks of lovely life they weep;
Then pleas'd reflect, to die is but to ſleep.'
Temple of Nature. Canto II.

" I ſuſpect that my intimate friend and correſpondent Bonaparte [Buonaparté] is a full convert to Dr. Darwin's doctrine of death and its conſequences. For, when he declared to Lord Whitworth his determination to invade England, although there were an hundred chances to one in *favour* of his going to the bottom, he was undoubtedly calculating on a comfortable nap after the fatigues of government."

Will

Will, after death, be ſure to riſe
In bats and bed-bugs, fleas and flies.*

" Beſides, they'll make, when kill'd in fight,
Vaſt ' monuments of paſt delight ;'†
And that to *think* of is more pleaſant,
Than ſuch delight *enjoy'd* at preſent."

A Collection of Pſalms and Hymns, extracted, revised, and publiſhed; by the Rev. W. B. Williams, B. A. Miniſter of Homerton Chapel, Middleſex; and Chaplain to the Marquis of Downſhire. 18mo. Pp. 200. Williams. 1804.

WE ought to apologize to our *poetical* readers for claſſing this wretched farrago of enthuſiaſtical cant and methodiſtical preſumption under the head, *Poetry*; for not one feature of Poetry is to be diſcerned in nine-tenths of the *Pſalms* and *Hymns* here preſented to the public. It is a melancholy ſubject for reflection to all ſerious and ſober Chriſtians, that the weak minds of the lower claſſes of people ſhould be filled with ſuch miſerable ſtuff as is contained in this volume, calculated certainly to inſpire them with the moſt dangerous preſumption, hoſtile to the meek and humble ſpirit of Chriſtian-

---

" * In bats and bed-bugs, fleas and flies.
' Thus when a monarch or a muſhroom dies,
Awhile extinct the organic matter lies;
But as a few ſhort hours or years revolve,
Alchemic powers the changing maſs diſſolve;
Born to new life unnumber'd inſects pant, &c."
Temple of Nature, Canto IV.

"It has been a matter of curious enquiry among ſome of my correſponding garretteers, whether this piloſopher himſelf, in the latter ſtages of his exiſtence, enjoyed much conſolation from reflecting that the ' organic matter' which entered into his own compoſition, was about to be employed for the important purpoſe of giving ' new life' to ' unnumbered inſects.'

† " Vaſt ' monuments of paſt delight.'
' Thus the tall mountains, that emboſs the land,
Huge iſles of rocks, and continents of ſand;
Whoſe dim extent eludes the inquiring ſight,
ARE MIGHTY MONUMENTS OF PAST DELIGHT.'

" The ' monuments of paſt delight,' Darwin ſays,

' Roſe from the wreck of animal or beaſt.'

" Thus taught by this wondrous ſage, I truſt the friends to humanity will ſuppoſe it beſt to let the poor, infirm, and decrepid, die off as faſt as poſſible to ' manure the earth,' that the quantity of organized matter of which they are compoſed, may revive in the forms of millions of microſcopic animals, vegetables, and inſects, make ' monuments of paſt delight,' &c. Therefore it is to be hoped, that the promoters of the Perkinean Inſtitution will prove as deſpicable in reſpect to numbers, as they are deficient in underſtanding, eſpecially in comprehending the great and glorious truths of modern philoſophy."

ity;

ity; and with a deſtructive confidence, ariſing from an *alledged certainty* of ſalvation, on the firſt moment of *Belief*. It is really ſhocking to ſee the venerable Biſhop Horne preſſed into ſuch company as Meſſrs. Williams, Toplady, Newton, Haweis, &c. &c. The 29th Hymn, addreſſed to *The Trinity*, is a parody of *God save the King!* We ſhall exhibit two or three ſpecimens of this notable production, which will ſuffice to convince our readers of the juſtice of our animadverſions.

HYMN 1. *(Toplady.)*

" A debtor to mercy alone
Of covenant mercy I ſing;
Nor fear with thy righteouſneſs on,
My perſon and offerings to bring:
The terrors of Law and of God
With me can have nothing to do,
My Saviour's obedience and blood
Hide all my tranſgreſſions from view.

" The work which his goodneſs began,
The arm of his ſtrength will complete;
His promiſe is Yea and Amen,
And never was forfeited yet.
Things future nor things that are now,
Not all things below nor above
Can make him his purpoſe forego,
Or ſever my ſoul from his love.

" My name from the palms of his hands
Eternity will not eraſe;
Impreſs'd on his heart it remains
In marks of indelible grace:

Yes, I to the end ſhall endure,
As ſure as the earneſt is given,
More happy, but *not more ſecure,*
The glorify'd ſpirits in heaven!!!"

" HYMN 25.—*(Hart.)*

" An Invitation to Sinners to *confide!*

" Let not conſcience make you linger,
Nor of *fitneſs* fondly dream;
All the fitneſs he requireth,
Is to feel your need of him:
This he gives you;
'Tis his Spirit's riſing beam.

" Come, ye weary, heavy laden,
Loſt and ruin'd by the fall!
If you tarry till you're better,
You will never come at all:
Not the righteous
Sinners Jeſus come to call."

Much in the ſame ſtrain of *comfort* and *confidence* is

" HYMN

" HYMN 57.

" Hither ye poor, ye rich, ye blind,
A ſin-diſorder'd trembling throng;
To you the goſpel calls, to you
Meſſiah's bleſſings all belong.

" Reaſon's and virtue's boaſting ſons,
Derive no bleſſings from his tree;
For ſinners only Jeſus dy'd—
Then ſure I hear he died for me."

" 'Twas with our griefs Meſſiah groan'd,
'Twas with our guilt his ſoul was try'd!
Our puniſhment he took, he bore,
And ſinners liv'd when Jeſus dy'd."

" HYMN 136.

" Truly bleſſed is this ſtation,
Low and full before his croſs;
When I ſee his great ſalvation,
All things elſe I count but droſs.
Here it is I find my heav'n,
While upon the Lamb I gaze,
Love I much, I've much forgiv'n;
I'm a miracle of grace!"

" HYMN 140.

" My ſoul attempt no more to draw,
Thy life and comfort from the law:
Fly to the hope the goſpel gives;
The man who truſts the promiſe lives."

" HYMN 142.

" *The moment* a ſinner believes,
And truſts in his crucify'd God,
His pardon *at once* he receives,
Redemption in full thro' his blood."

One jam ſatis eſt! No wonder that ſuch *comfortable* doctrine as this makes numerous converts to ſchiſm! But it is a wonder that any man, who has a right to prefix the epithet *reverend* to his name, ſhould have the folly or the aſſurance to prefix his name to ſuch a farrago as that before us!

The Britiſh Volunteer, or Loyal Songſter. Being a collection of entirely new Songs, for all patriotic Companies; including thoſe on the Subject ſung at the different places of public Amuſement. Several written purpoſ ly for this Work, and adapted to familiar Tunes. To which is added a Selection of of ſuitable Toaſts and Sentiments. 12mo. PP. 38. 6d. Neil, Sommer's Town.

MANY of theſe ſongs are not leſs diſtinguiſhed by poetical talent than by patriotic ſentiment; and ſuch attempts to cheriſh and to rouſe the national ſpirit, at a criſis which calls for the fulleſt diſplay of it, are highly praiſe-worthy.

NOVELS

NOVELS AND TALES.

Heliodora, or the Grecian Minstrel. Translated from the German of Baron Göethe. 3 vols. 12mo. Pp. 636. Dutton. 1804.

WE opened these volumes with no small degree of curiosity, from a recollection of one of the first productions of the author, *The Sorrows of Werter*, and from a knowledge of his subsequent life and writings; fully expecting to find them deeply tainted with that gross immorality and contempt of religion which so strongly mark the conduct and the writings of that school to which BARON GOETHE belongs. We were, however, agreeably disappointed; since, with very few exceptions, we found *Heliodora* to be an harmless, and an interesting tale; the incidents in which, though sometimes highly improbable, are well managed, and not unnatural. The characters are pourtrayed with a masterly hand; and, which is of more consequence, the moral is unexceptionable—vice meeting with its due punishment, and virtue with her proper reward. A great deal indeed is said about *fate* and *nature*; but nothing of nature's God. Speaking of the "Jerusalem delivered" of Tasso, the Baron has the presumption to represent it as a poem, which, with the exception of "a few beautiful episodes," is of "no value on the whole." This dogmatical sentence is, of itself, sufficiently strange, but the reason on which it appears to be founded is still stranger. "The *Christian Mythology* seemed to her cold and dead, and the object for which its heroes employed their valour entirely *founded on opinion*. Hence a war of opinions she considered as unworthy of the exertion of the poetic muse. But when she took up Homer, and mingled in his living world of gods and men, where the hearts and the passions of the heroes are on fire, how cold and lifeless appeared those knights of the holy sepulchre!" *Christianity* may, perhaps *now* be deemed a *fable* by *Goethe*, and his associate *Wieland*, who has publicly renounced its tenets, and impiously blasphemed its divine author; but the time will come when these vain philosophists, and their wretched votaries, bursting as they are with the vanity of human reason, will be compelled to acknowledge its reality, when too late to avert the punishments which it denounces on obstinate unbelievers.

The translation is well executed, with the exception of some few expressions, which are not *English*.

The Life of Napoleon, as it should be handed down to Posterity. By J. M—D. 12mo. Pp. 150. Parsons and Son. 1804.

WE have strong objections to any book in which *fiction* is blended with *fact*, since it tends to mislead young minds which are incapable of separating the one from the other. We have another objection too, to a fictitious life of the hero of this little volume. For, however ingenious a writer may be, however inventive his faculties, however fertile his imagination, we defy him to fabricate such a series of complicated horrors, crimes, and enormities, as the faithful page of history presents, in recording the *real* life and actions of Napoleone Buonaparté. The volume before us contains nothing that is improbable; but it falls very far short of the truth;—it is well written; the moral is good; and the principles and sentiments, in general, unexceptionable. We say, in *general*, because we must except the reflections at the beginning of the 6th chapter of the first book, which betray gross ig-

norance of the ſubject, and ſhew that the author has been weak enough to adopt the falſe aſſertions of the Jacobins, French and Engliſh, who, and who *alone*, had the folly, or rather the effrontery, to aſcribe the enormities which marked the origin and progreſs of the French Revolution, to the oppoſition which it experienced from the beſt and wiſeſt men in Europe.

Auguſtus and Mary; or the Maid of Buttermere, a domeſtic Tale. By William Mudford. 1 vol. 12mo. Pp. 188. Jones. 1804.

THIS tale is founded on a well-known, but very melancholy incident. The characters of the father and mother are well drawn. Mary is a very intereſting picture; the object and tendency of the whole is to inculcate virtue, and to caution ſimplicity againſt deception. The main tale we believe cloſely adheres to the original facts, therefore, any analyſis of it would be ſuperfluous. The under tale of Louiſa Faulkner and William Stitchum ſeems to be foiſted in without any connection with the fate of the heroine, and anſwers no other purpoſe than to ſwell the book. The author alſo tries ſatire, which being beyond his reach, he ſubſtitutes abuſe. Mr. William Gifford is not an object to be hurt by the attacks of ſuch a puny aſſailant.

Sherwood Foreſt; or Northern Adventures, a Novel. By Mrs. Villa-Real Gooch. 3 vols. 12mo. Pp. 720. Highley. 1804.

IF the authoreſs of this production writes for amuſement, we adviſe her to take to ſome paſtime that may not be ſo public; if ſhe write from neceſſity we are truly ſorry for her, ſince the proceeds of ſuch a work muſt afford a very ſcanty ſupply. Whatever may be her purpoſe in giving theſe effuſions to the world, our duty is the ſame—to eſtimate the performance by its intrinſic merit.

In a preface, our noveliſt introduces ſeveral very great names, and, at their head, Homer, to prove that "the fire of genius is ſeldom *lit* but at the lamp of adverſity." This ſentiment ſhe expands in a fine-ſounding period full of long words, and epithets, and rhetorical figures. "Poverty in this, as it is called, enlightened age, treads upon the heels of genius, and *anticipates every progreſſive ſtep by rude aſſailment, and by the ſcorpion ſting of acute recollection.*"

To attempt an analyſis of this work would be taking up ſpace and time which we can beſtow to much more advantage on publications of importance. We muſt allow, however, that the paſſages before us are *harmleſs*. The ſtory is the old ſtory that has been ſo often repeated; the whole eſſence of which is compreſſed in the two firſt verſes of *an old ſong*.

"There *once* did live a lady fair,
And ſhe was in love with a gentleman."

In Sherwood Foreſt there are half a dozen of ladies fair; and they are *all* in love. Their loves are ſo intermixed and complex, that we could hardly diſcover, *who and who are together*. Their various adventures convey to the reader the following information,—that, if agreeable young men, and agreeable young women often meet together, it is probable love may ariſe. Indeed the authoreſs makes good a poſition that *there is in the ſexes a tendency to mutual affection*! This is the *novelty*, and the whole novelty which her ingenuity has diſcovered, and her ability exhibited; and deſerves equal praiſe with

with the reſearch of a ſchoolmaſter recorded in Gil Blas: the ſaid preceptor informed the world, that in Athens *children cried when they were whipt.*

The Duchess of La Valliere, an historical Romance. By Madam de Genlis. Translated from the French. 2 vols. 12mo. Pp. 480. Murray. 1804.

THIS is a work much ſuperior in ability, and literary merit, to the preceding article; nevertheleſs there is a mixture of objectionable with laudable ſentiments and repreſentations, which renders it at leaſt of a very doubtful tendency.

The hiſtory of Mademoiſelle de la Valliere is well known to that claſs of readers, who have a pleaſure in ſtudying the intrigues and gallantries of courts, more than the politics of nations. The real amount of her ſtory is, ſhe was a lovely woman of noble birth, attracted the love of Louis XIV. was many years his miſtreſs; but being deſerted for another, became penitent, and ſpent the remainder of her days in a cloiſter. She never took any ſhare in public affairs, therefore, her life is not, like that of Madame de Maintenon, of any political importance; nor indeed of more biographical importance, than the life of any other concubine who lives in a ſtate of adultery. Attached as we are to kings and princes, WE DO NOT CONCEIVE THAT THE EMBRACES OF ROYALTY CONSECRATE PROSTITUTION; OR THAT AN ADULTRESS IS ONE WHIT LESS AN ADULTRESS BECAUSE HER PARAMOUR IS A PRINCE. Soften her ſituation by as many mild names as you will, the Ducheſs of La Valliere was a harlot; and therefore unworthy the countenance of every virtuous woman. This kept miſtreſs had no doubt many to pay her court, ſince in all ages there will be ſycophants who will bow to vice when it is connected with greatneſs; but the dignity of virtue and genuine religion will avoid the pollution of ſuch aſſociates.

The romance before us repreſents Mademoiſelle de la Valliere as a young lady of great beauty and accompliſhments; and alſo of very amiable diſpoſitions: with that extreme ſenſibility of heart, which unleſs accompanied with firmneſs of principle and conduct, often betrays a woman to ruin. Having loſt her parents at ſeventeen years of age, ſhe was appointed Maid of Honor to Henrietta of England, wife of the Duke of Orleans, only brother to his Moſt Chriſtian Majeſty. One of the handſomeſt and moſt engaging men at the court of Verſailles was the king, about twenty two years of age, and lately married to the Infanta of Spain. Mademoiſelle frequently ſaw this prince; and before ſhe was known to him, *her sensible heart* was captivated by his charms, although *he was married.* At length he diſcovered her paſſion; and after ſuch a diſcovery ſeduction naturally followed. Though ſhe yielded to her lover, ſhe ſtill retained ſo much of virtuous ſentiment as to feel great compunction for her fall. This part of the work ſeems very well intended to exhibit the ſufferings which ariſe to the votaries of pleaſurable vice, whoſe principles are not entirely corrupted, nor their feelings become callous. In this view the object of the work is meritotious. But, on the other hand, a conſiderable part of the lady's uneaſineſs ariſes more from doubts concerning her lover's conſtancy, than remorſe for her own conduct. Beſides, we muſt give very little credit to the *conscience of a lady who continues in the commission of adultery.* The fact was, ſhe did not actually repent until forſaken by her royal lover. Seceſſion from the world, when ſhe was deprived of that vicious intercourſe in which ſhe had ſo long indulged, can hardly be

regarded as an act of virtue and piety. It was certainly much better to retire to the monaſtery of the Carmelites, than to follow the uſual mode of kept miſtreſſes, who, on loſing one gallant, try to find another; but her motive was evidently not remorſe for her own conduct, for ſhe was manifeſtly diſpoſed to continue concubine to the king, as long as he was diſpoſed to retain her in that capacity. She left the world in diſguſt, becauſe a favourite man had left her for another. This is the motive and amount of her penitence as ſet forth in the novel Her ſentiments and conduct are preſented as laudable on very falſe grounds.—The tendency of the work is to ſoften our abhorrence of vice, by accompanying that vice with many amiable and ſome reſpectable qualities. The Ducheſs de la Valliere might be mild, benevolent, compaſſionate, charitable—but ſhe was an habitual adultreſs. And an habitual adultreſs ought never to be held up to eſteem and veneration.

Such a picture cannot be beneficial to young females, who are a claſs of readers very likely to peruſe ſuch a romance. The intention of the writer may be good; but we cannot think the tendency good; and therefore do not recommend the performance to our readers.

MISCELLANIES.

Istructions for Yeomanry and Volunteer Cavalry. By Colonel Herries, of the Light Horſe Volunteers of London and Weſtminſter. Part I. Second Edition. 8vo. Pp. 256. Egerton. 1804.

"THE following Treatiſe," ſays Colonel Herries, in his *Introduction*, "is founded upon, and in all material reſpects conformable to, *His Majeſty's Regulations for the Cavalry*; a book which every officer ought carefully to ſtudy, and to which frequent reference muſt be made for explanations and details not immediately neceſſary in the preſent work, which only comprehends what appears to be moſt eſſential to the Volunteer Cavalry, for whoſe uſe alone it is deſigned."

Since the recommencement of hoſtilities, ſo many, and ſo various, have been the publications which have iſſued from the preſs, profeſſing to inſtruct our Volunteers in the different branches of military diſcipline, that we have been wearied almoſt to ſatiety with peruſing them. So little, however, of real merit, has appeared on the ſubject, that we were peculiarly pleaſed on witneſſing the annunciation of a work from the pen of Colonel Herries, a gentleman of much experience and aſſiduity, and of courſe well qualified for the taſk which he had undertaken.

We ſhall preſent our readers with a brief analyſis of the contents of the volume before us; previouſly to which, however, we ſhall take the liberty of quoting the opinion of its author, on what has been the ſubject of much diſcuſſion, both in and out of Parliament.

"In order to employ this ſpecies of force," [the Yeoman and Volunteer Cavalry], obſerves Colonel Herries, "with the greateſt effect, and to derive from it that important aſſiſtance which it may reaſonably be expected to afford, as well in the encounter of a foreign invader, as in the preſervation of internal tranquillity, it would probably not be brigaded with regulars, or employed to act *in the line*, except on particular occaſions. Conſidering the character and compoſition of the Volunteer Cavalry, it ſeems that

that its peculiar province would be the buſineſs of light troops acting in ſeperate detachments; a ſervice which offers full ſcope to the courage, activity, and intelligence of every individual, and which of courſe preſents the beſt field for the diſplay of thoſe advantages which Gentlemen and Yeomen muſt neceſſarily poſſeſs over *privates* of every other deſcription; to whom they muſt, generally ſpeaking, always remain inferior in the ordinary duties of the *common ſoldier*."

The firſt Chapter of this Treatiſe relates to horſes, and the moſt approved methods of training them for military ſervice. The ſecond preſents a full and perſpicuous explanation of military terms. The third conſiſts of inſtructions preparatory to the drill, illuſtrative of the firſt principles of military tactics. The fourth Chapter is appropriated to riding, with much uſeful information relative to the choice and management of horſe-furniture and accoutrements. The fifth contains inſtructions for the drill, in five claſſes. The ſixth ſuppoſes a troop and ſquadron formed, and going through their different evolutions on the parade.

To remedy the inconvenience ariſing from there being a variety of inſtructors, who teach according to their different modes, and the different degrees of knowledge which they poſſeſs, " it has been the firſt object of the preſent work," ſays our author, " to lay down ſuch a ſyſtem of drilling, as will not only aſſiſt and accelerate the progreſs of the private, (who in theſe corps is capable of uniting theory with practice, and can improve himſelf by reading as well as by exerciſe), but will enable the officer of any Volunteer Corps to ſuperintend the conduct of his drill-ſerjeant, and to determine immediately, whether he is inſtructing the men in conformity to the eſtabliſhed regulation, and whether he employs the proper word of command for every charge which it is intended to effect."

We underſtand from our author, that it was his intention to place, under the head of *General Obſervations*, the ſubſtance of what is contained in the beſt authorities, relative to the movements of a ſquadron of light cavalry; and the reſerve for the *Second Part* of his treatiſe, the manœuvres of a regiment, the duties of volunteer cavalry in garriſon and in the field, &c. &c.; but the duty which he owes to the corps which he has the honour to command, particularly at this moment, has prevented him from finiſhing the work.

We cannot but regret that a Treatiſe ſo valuable ſhould remain unfiniſhed. As far, however, as the preſent volume goes, it may be conſidered complete, and we will venture to aſſert, that, by an attentive peruſal thereof, a perſon may acquire more theoretical knowledge—and of that deſcription of theoretical knowledge which may eaſily be reduced to practice—in one day, than by the verbal inſtructions of a drill-ſerjeant for a month.

After what we have ſaid, we can only expreſs our hope, that when the " piping times of peace" ſhall return—ſhould the *deſtinies* of the new *Emperor* of the French REPUBLIC permit ſuch a period to arrive—our author will not neglect the completion of the taſk which he originally contemplated.

A Conciſe Introduction to the Latin Language, compiled from ancient and modern Writers of approved authority. For the uſe of the Middle Forms in Grammar Schools. By the Rev. George Whittaker, A. M. 12mo. C. Law, Longman and Rees, London; B. C. Collins, Saliſbury; T. and G. Burdon, Wincheſter; T. Skelton, Southampton.

THIS work is founded on the baſis of Lilly's grammer, but contains many very judicious alterations and improvements, among which the moſt deſerving of notice are, the addition of Greek nouns to the ſubſtantives, and a new arrangement of the pronouns; the verbs alſo are much better explained to the Engliſh pupil than in any Latin grammar we have yet ſeen, and the ſyntax, though ſhorter than that of Lilly, and leſs encumbered with examples, and conſequently leſs burthenſome to the memory, contains all that is ſufficient for the learner at the age for which it is intended; and, indeed, when it is once maſtered by the boy, the man will have little more to acquire to become an accurate grammarian.

We are ſurpriſed that no teacher of Latin grammar, who ſtudies the memory of his pupils, has diſcarded the vocative caſe: it ſhould be mentioned only as an anomaly in the ſingular number of the ſecond declenſion in thoſe nouns which end in *us*. The following rule in ſyntax is alſo very inaccurately expreſſed in Lilly, "Eſt pro habeo regit dativum;" but it is ſtill more ſo by Mr. Whittaker, who ſubſtitutes *sum* for *est*; for in this caſe the verb ſubſtantive is uſed imperſonally, and conſequently has neither firſt nor ſecond perſon; but the more accurate mode of expreſſion would be *est* followed by a dative caſe has the meaning of *habeo*; for when it thus acquires the meaning of *habeo*, it retains its primitive government of the nominative caſe, as in the example here given to illuſtrate the rule:

Est mihi namque domi *pater* eſt *injuſta noverca.*

We heartily recommend this grammar to the attention of all ſchoolmaſters who wiſh to abridge the labour of their pupils, without in the leaſt diminiſhing the fruit of that labour; and we think it need only be known to be adopted in all ſchools where Lilly's grammar is now taught.

REVIEWERS REVIEWED.

Outlines of a Philoſophy of the Hiſtory of Man, tranſlated from the German of JOHN GODFREY HERDER, *Superintendant of the Clergy of the Duchy of Weimar.* By T. Churchill. The ſecond edition, in 2 vols. 8vo. Johnſon. 1804.

THE Monthly Reviewers begin their account of this work with acknowledging that *their* readers are entitled to ſome apology, or ſome reaſon, for the late appearance of the article. The apology which they make, if apology it can be called, is far from ſatisfactory. As our delay has been ſtill longer than their's, an apology would certainly be due from us, were not we perſuaded that *our* readers have had *plus quam ſatis* of the unmeaning ravings of Herder. The truth is, that we had no intention of blotting our pages with any thing more of this infidel divine after the view which we gave of his *oriental dialogues*; but our intention was completely changed by the character given of him in the Review, to which

we have referred *. Herder has now paid the debt of nature, and "gone to his own place;" and, though we do not acknowledge, in its full extent, the truth of the maxim, *Nil niſi bonum de mortuis*, we ſhould yet be ſorry to leave on the minds of our readers an unfavourable impreſſion of the memory of a man "of great information, liberal views, and ſingular impartiality, with as few prejudices and as little vice as ever belong to a human being!"

We ſat down, therefore, to peruſe with attention theſe outlines of *philoſophical hiſtory*, or *hiſtorical philoſophy*, (for neither the author nor his tranſlator ſeems perfectly decided which of theſe titles would beſt ſuit the work), and the firſt thing that attracted our attention was the tranſlator's modeſty and ſingular regard for truth. The tranſlator of the *oriental dialogues* very ſoon diſguſts his reader with Gaelic fictions relating to *Oſſian* and *Job*, and with his preſumption in claiming a right to change the arrangement which had been formed by his author; but very different is the language and conduct of Mr. Churchill.

"Every one," ſays he, "who is acquainted with HERDER, muſt be aware of the difficulty, if not *impoſſibility*, of transferring his ſpirit, his 'words that burn,' into another language. To have undertaken a taſk ſo arduous, may be deemed preſumption in me; and *none* can be *more ſenſible* than *myſelf*, that, in the execution of it, I am far, very far, from having done *what I wiſhed*, and what it would have been the height of my ambition to have accompliſhed."

That no one can be *more* ſenſible than Mr. Churchill, that he is far from having done *what he wiſhed* is a truth incontrovertible, becauſe no one, but himſelf, can poſſibly know *what* he *wiſhed* to accompliſh; but his anxiety to prevent his readers from falling into a miſtake on *this* point is a pledge that he deſigns not wilfully to deceive them; whilſt his own modeſt reſpect for the tranſcendent abilities of his author affords good ſecurity for his faithfully endeavouring to perform the *impoſſible* taſk which he has undertaken. But, bleſs us! what geniuſes are the Germans! Homer has hitherto been deemed to have as much ſpirit, and as many "words that burn" as moſt authors. Yet Pope has, in many inſtances, though certainly not in all, transferred his ſpirit and his burning completely into the Engliſh language; but a greater than Pope would fail in attempting to do the ſame thing for Herder. Should any one inquire into the propriety of expreſſing philoſophical diſquiſition in "burning words," Mr. Churchill, we doubt not, is able to ſatisfy him, though we are not; for to us preciſion and perſpicuity have always appeared to conſtitute the whole excellence of a philoſophical ſtyle. Perhaps the *burning* has, on this occaſion, been preferred to the *cool* and *ſimple* ſtyle, to render the book worthy of being dedicated to GOD, which it is in the following ſingular paragraph:

"Thus, Great Being, Inviſible Supreme Diſpoſer of our race, I lay at thy feet the moſt imperfect work that mortal ever wrote, in which he has ventured to trace and follow thy ſteps. Its leaves may decay, and its characters vaniſh; forms after forms, too, in which I have diſcerned traces of thee, and endeavoured to exhibit them to my brethren, may moulder into duſt; but thy purpoſes will remain, and thou wilt gradually unfold them to thy

* Monthly Review, Auguſt 1803.

creatures, and exhibit them in nobler forms. Happy, if then theſe leave ſhall be ſwallowed up in the ſtream of oblivion, and in their ſtead clearer ideas ariſe in the mind of man.

"HERDER."

Thus does the author conclude his *preface*, after which the reader will not be ſurpriſed at finding him "begin his Philoſophy of the Hiſtory of Man from *heaven*." The work is divided into twenty books, and each book ſubdivided into a greater or ſmaller number of chapters. To each chapter is prefixed a *title* or *contents*; but the *books* have not ſeparately that honour. This we think a defect, and, to ſhew our regard for the memory of Herder, we ſhall, in part at leaſt, ſupply the defect by entitling the firſt book,

CELESTIAL NEWS, or the GAZETTE of COSMOGONY.

This book is divided into ſeven chapters, of which the firſt informs us that the earth is a *ſtar among ſtars*; that it poſſeſſes *faculties* ſimilar to thoſe of an artiſt; that the law of gravitation is *eternal*; that, as "the planets revolve round one common centre, in ſpaces proportionate to their magnitudes and denſities," Jupiter and Saturn are bodies many millions of times *denſer* than *Mercury!* that our ſun and planets, with a whole galaxy of ſuns and planets, revolve round the *Dog ſtar*; and that the human ſoul is not merely immortal, but abſolutely *eternal*, as God is eternal! This laſt piece of information muſt be confeſſed to be rather ſtale, having been often repeated by the philoſophers of antient Greece; but of the preceding articles the greater part have ſurely the charm of novelty.

In the ſecond chapter the author expreſſes a *modeſt* regret that he cannot travel to the moon, Venus, and Jupiter, and ſurvey the manners and cuſtoms of their inhabitants; thinks it highly probable that, in ſome future period of his exiſtence, he ſhall wander from planet to planet; and wiſhes that he could, at preſent, ride through the whole regions of heaven on the *hair of a comet!* In this chapter, ſuch is the *burning* of his *words*, that we are ſometimes tempted to ſuſpect that it has conſumed his meaning. Thus, when he ſays that "in us the relation of matter to mind is probably proportionate to the length of our days and nights;" and that "the celerity of our thoughts is, probably, as the revolutions of our planet round itſelf, and round the ſun, to thoſe of either ſtar," his meaning has either evaporated in ſmoke, or lies buried in aſhes. The ſame thing may be ſaid of the ſentence, in which it is affirmed, that "*ſpirit* and *morals* are phyſical, and obey, only in a ſuperior degree, the ſame laws (with matter), all of which ultimately depend on the ſolar ſyſtem."

It is obſerved, in the third chapter, that the earth has undergone many revolutions, of which ſome were *accidental* and ſome *neceſſary*. Of the *accidental* revolutions no theory is to be looked for; "but of the eſſential and primitive revolutions of our earth," ſays the author, "I could wiſh the theory might be diſcovered before I die; and I even hope it will." This hope was built on the analyſis by which "the *electric* matter, and in ſome meaſure the *magnetic* have been reſolved," or, as the tranſlator expreſſes it, "reduced to their *ſimple principles!*" but, alas! *rational* and *well grounded* as ſuch a hope muſt have appeared, it has been fruſtrated. Herder is dead, and the expected theory is not yet diſcovered! An approach, however was made towards the diſcovery by himſelf. "Before our air, our water, our earth could be produced, various reciprocally, diſſolving, and precipitating *ſtamina* were neceſſary." Though we are not told *totidem verbis* what theſe

ſtamina

ſtamina were, the information is collected with *certainty*, from the following aſſertion. "At ſtated periods, air, fire, water, the earth, aroſe from theſe *ſpiritual* and *material ſtamina*." Nature was under the neceſſity of producing her leaſt perfect creatures firſt. Air, water, and light were firſt formed; then vegetables; then the inferior animals; and laſt of all man, when the earth had advanced towards maturity. Now, alas! the poor earth has become *old*; and when ſhe ſhall be completely ſuperannuated, "the eternal laws of wiſdom and order" require that "the ſun ſhall attract into his fiery boſom, thoſe powers which ſhe can no longer renovate and uphold; and this the ſun may do (without any violation of juſtice), after having ſo long warmed us with his paternal care, foſtered all living beings, and linked them to his cheering viſage with golden bands."

In the fourth chapter the author deſcends a little from his aërial flight, and communicates information relating chiefly to this earth. He firſt preſents inſtruction to the geometricians: and as what he ſays of the *ſphere* ſeems to be new, we recommend it to the conſideration of the Univerſity of Cambridge, which, great as our reſpect is for that learned and ſcientific body, we more than ſuſpect to be little converſant with ſuch ſpeculations as thoſe which employ the minds of the philoſophers at Weimar. "The ſphere is the moſt perfect figure; containing the *greateſt ſurface* with the *leaſt mass*; it is, *therefore*, the figure of the earth." The author declares, if the tranſlation be correct, that "his book will be ſacred to him, as long as he beholds the circumambient heaven above him, and this all-including ſelf-encircling earth beneath his feet."—"Every thing on the circumference of this earth is a *wheel*, as appears from the ſhades of the earth in the moon." Had mankind ſeriouſly conſidered the *ſpherical* figures of the earth, they never could have been ſo *abſurd* as to murder one another for errors in philoſophy or religion; but it would appear that, in the author's opinion, ſuch murders might have been perpetrated without abſurdity, on a *critical* or *cylindrical* earth. He ſeems to doubt whether the diviſion of the globe into *climates* be not a Ptolemean *prejudice*, but is very certain that, "while the ball revolves, HEADS" (*human* heads doubtleſs) "revolve on it as *climates*; MANNERS and RELIGIONS, or diſpoſitions and *garments*!"

Boys at ſchool, at leaſt Engliſh boys, when firſt taught the diurnal rotation of the earth, find ſome difficulty in conceiving what keeps themſelves and others from falling headlong into the immenſe void; but our author, who hopes that theſe *outlines of the philoſophy of hiſtory* may become a ſchool-book, has kindly furniſhed them with a ſolution of the difficulty. "Nature," ſays he, "has faſtened *a gentle weight to our feet* to give us uniformity and *ſtability*: in the material world it is called GRAVITY; in the immaterial, INDOLENCE!"

We are next favoured with the reaſon (and a very delicate reaſon it is) why a man loves his *country* and his *wife*. It is "not becauſe they are the beſt in the world, but becauſe they are abſolutely *his own*, and becauſe he loves *himſelf*, and his own *labours in them*!" "The central point of the earth is every where!"—"Man is the LORD and SERVANT of Nature; her moſt BELOVED CHILD, and at the ſame time perhaps her moſt rigidly SUBJUGATED SLAVE!"—"The meaſure of our faculties, the revolutions of our different ages, the changes of our occupations, phenomena, and thoughts, the nullity or duration of our reſolves and acts: all theſe, we ſhall find, are ultimately connected with the ſimple law of the viciſſitudes of days and ſeaſons." Still more extraordinary than all this, we are told, that if man lived

longer

longer than he does, his "empire on earth would not be so extensive!" Through the whole of this chapter, as in in some parts of the preceding, the author's meaning, if not *burnt* up, is dreadfully scorched.

The fifth chapter begins with informing us that we are composed of *ether*, and *therefore* "incapable of breathing *pure air*;" and that "the air, *in all likelihood*, was the magazine which contained the powers and materials which formed the earth." Then follows an attempt to compound into one system the old and new chemistry, by affirming, that among the powers which act through the medium of the air, are found both *phlogiston* and *oxygen*. After which we are told that "the air is the *matter* of terrestrial creatures, as well as of the *earth* itself;" and, rising with his subject, the author boldly pronounces "the air the CREATOR *of this globe!*" Then follows the fable of Prometheus, which he seems to give as true history. Of the air, which is indeed the *organ* of the Deity, "all the qualities and phenomena are said to be constituted by immaterial powers, which operate in the atmosphere!"

To prevent a mistake, into which it seems men of genius on the continent are liable to fall, the author assures his reader that "the earth is not ALONE in the UNIVERSE!" that "other celestial beings operate upon its atmosphere; and that the sun, that globe of *eternal* fire, governs it with his beams" The moon, however, acts a very important part. She "hangs even within the earth's atmosphere," which we suppose to have been the *fact* which excited the author's modest and rational wish to travel to her; but though he means not to have had that wish literally gratified, he obtained what was surely a better thing—"the power of almost working miracles."—"In the wide labyrinth of contending powers, has the human understanding found a clew, and almost performed miracles; guided principally by the irregular MOON FORTUNATELY placed so near us!"

> "Sick was the sun, the owl forsook his bow'r,
> The moon-struck prophet felt the madding hour,"

and attempted to revive the study of *astrology*. "Were all these observations, and their results, ever applied to our aërial ark, as they have already been to the ebb and flow of our ocean, I am of opinion," says the author, "*astrology* would appear anew among our sciences in the most respectable and useful form." In the mean time, till that grand revolution in science shall take place, he contents himself with applying his discoveries to the improvement of metaphysics and politics.

"Be this (the revival of astrology) as it may, we *are*, and we *grow*, we *wander*, and we *toil*, under or in a sea of *celestial powers*, part of which we have observed, and of part of which we have formed conjectures. Since air and weather have so much power over us, and the whole earth; in all likelihood it was here an *electric spark* that shot more pure into *this human being*; there a portion of *inflammable matter* (Q. Hydrogen Gas) more forcibly compressed into that; here a *mass of mere* COLDNESS *and* SERENITY; there a *soft, mollifying, diffusive essence*: that determined and produced the greatest epoch and revolutions of human kind!!!"

The information which is first given in the sixth chapter will certainly surprize those plain people who have been accustomed to consider mountains as mere excrescences on the surface of the earth. This is so far from being in reality the case, that from "a simple inspection of a *map* of the world it is apparent that chains of mountains constitute the *skeleton on which the land was formed*, just as muscular flesh was formed on the ribs and other bones,

bones, which conſtitute the ſkeleton of the human body!" "Thus America, even according to its figure, is a ſtripe of earth appended to its mountains!" So are Aſia, Africa, and Europe. "Thus the production of the firſt mountains determined how the earth ſhould exiſt as dry land. They ſeem, as it were, the antient nuclei, or buttreſſes of the earth, on which the air and water only depoſited their burdens, till at length a place for vegetable organization was laid down, and ſpread out." Yet the author is doubtful whether theſe mountains of ſo much importance in coſmogony be any thing more than "HARNISHERS;" though he has not told us where the horſes that wore them, exiſted before the formation of the earth; which is probably one of the queſtions which remain to be ſolved, and of which he much wiſhed to ſee a ſolution!

He finds that Aſia was firſt inhabited, *because* "it poſſeſſed [poſſeſſes] the higheſt and broadeſt chains of mountains, and on the ridge a plain, which the ſea *never reached*." From Aſia he traces mankind through the other quarters of the globe, and finds the moſt ancient inhabitants of every country on the mountains. "As the mountains diſtribute *water* to the earth, ſo alſo diſtribute they *people*;" and it is to be ſuppoſed for the ſame reaſon, otherwiſe the ſimile would be impertinent. "One height produced nations of hunters, thus cheriſhing and rendering *necessary* a ſavage ſtate: another more extended and wild, afforded a field to the ſhepherd, and aſſociated with him inoffenſive animals: a third made agriculture eaſy and neceſſary: while a fourth led to *fiſhing*, to *navigation*, and to trade." We cannot but regret that our author has not told us in what region of the earth it is that men catch fiſh and navigate ſhips on the tops of high mountains; for, to our ſhame be it ſaid, we never heard of it before, though we have long known that "the ſtructure of our earth, in its natural variety and diverſity, rendered all theſe diſtinguiſhing periods and ſtates of men unavoidable." We have, indeed, been accuſtomed to look for the origin of *fiſhing* and *navigation* among the inhabitants of the ſea-ſhore; but to the ſea, navigable rivers, and great lakes, this pious prelate attributes other effects—even a variety of governments, cuſtoms, and religions among men.

"The inhabitants of America," he ſays, "dwelt too much ſeparated from one another by lakes and rivers, abrupt heights and precipices, for the culture of one region, or *the old word** of the tradition of their fathers, to eſtabliſh and extend itſelf as in the wide ſpread Aſia!" We are next informed why there is no *terra auſtralis* or ſouthern continent: it is, becauſe "in that deep ſea there is no primitive mountain high enough to *create* an extenſive firm bed!" We thought the *air* had been the creator; but why is there no high primitive mountain in the deep ſouth ſea? Philoſophiſm ſhould leave nothing unſolved. The aërial inſects will not here anſwer the purpoſe; for though theſe ſubordinate creatures "do what they can, and produce, perhaps, in ſome thouſands of years the little iſles, which appear as points in the ocean;" yet it ſeems their power, and indeed "the powers of this whole ſouthern region extend no farther." Is New Holland only a *point* in the Ocean?

In the ſeventh and laſt chapter of this firſt book, we have ſome reflections

---

* We ſhall not ſay what is meant by this *old word*; but ſuch of our readers as have looked into the *oriental dialogues*, or even peruſed with attention our Review of that work, can be in no doubt about it.

on the cauſe of the ſource of the higheſt chains of mountains in the old and new worlds, which are ſo tame that they might have been written by a *British* philoſopher. We are aſſured, however, that they will appear from the ſequel to be of great importance in the philoſophical hiſtory of man, when it will be ſeen that the author recovers his fire. The only burning paſſage in the preſent chapter is that in which it is affirmed, not merely that the higheſt mountains and deepeſt caverns are *actually* found in South America, but that in South America "ſtood ſide by ſide the giant and the dwarf, the wildeſt heights with the profoundeſt depths, of which any country on earth is CAPABLE!"

The ſecond book of this great work might be properly enough entitled,

PHISIOLOGICAL NEWS.

It is divided into four chapters, giving a *philoſophical* account of the proceſſes of *generation* and corruption; but, though this account is abundantly new and ſtrange, ſeveral reaſons conſpire to prevent us from analyzing it ſo minutely as we have analyzed the author's *Cosmogony*. 1. It is not very intelligible, "the burning of the words' having too often conſumed the meaning; 2. The chemiſtry of *generation* would hardly be reliſhed by ſuch of our *female* readers as have not been illuminized; and 3. The analyſis of the firſt book, which treats of Coſmogony, is alone ſufficient to ſhew

"How charming is divine poiloſophy!
Not harſh and crabbed, as dull fools ſuppoſe,
But muſical as is Apollo's lute!"

We muſt not, however, paſs over this ſecond book without favouring our readers with a few ſpecimens; and we ſhall begin with the proceſs by which our earth was fitted to become, what it is the object of the firſt chapter to prove it now is—*a grand manufactory, for the organization of very different beings.*

"As ſoon as granite, the nucleus, of our earth exiſted, there was alſo *light*, which in the thick vapours of our chaos, acted, perhaps as *fire* (what accurate chemiſtry?) There was a *more dense* and *powerful air*, than that we now enjoy; a more *compound* and *ponderous water* to operate upon it." (What third ingredient had made up the maſs of that ponderous water?) "*Penetrating acid diſſolved it*," (Q. the air or the water?), "and transformed it into STONES of other kinds! Perhaps the immenſe *ſands* of our earth are but the *aſhes* of this mouldered ſubſtance. The inflammable matter of the air probably converted *ſilex* into *calcareous earth*, and in this the firſt living creatures of the ſea, *ſhell-fiſh*, were formed; for throughout all nature the materials appear before the organized animated ſtructure. A ſtill more powerful and *pure* action of *fire* and of *cold* was requiſite to cryſtallization, which inclines not to the ſhelly form, exhibited by ſilex in its fractures, but to geometrical angles. Theſe too vary according to the component parts of each individual, till they approach the ſemi-metals, metals, and ultimately the *germes of plants!*" (p. 46.)

This is certainly precious philoſophy, as is likewiſe the *novel* information, that "had petroleum and ſulphur been ſpread over the ſurface of the globe in ſuch quantity as we now perceive ſand, clay, and fertile mould, the creatures that dwelt on it muſt have been different from what they now are!" "That nutritious plants are compoſed of milder ſalts, and oils, gradually prepared from *looſe ſand*, *tenacious clay*, and *moſſy peat*;" that the air "in the

realms

realms of Pluto" (the burning phraſe for gold-mines) " is unwholeſome to man, becauſe he CANNOT EAT GOLD!" and that " the littleneſs of man in the domains of nature, may be inferred from the *thin ſtratum* of fruitful mould, which alone is properly his territory."

In the ſecond chapter, where *the vegetable kingdom of our earth is conſidered with reſpect to the hiſtory of man*, we are told, that " man and animals are produced from *ſeed*, which, like the germ of a future tree, requires a matrix." But we muſt not purſue this ſubject; and ſhall only add, that men and trees, when they die, " reſign the little *phlogiſton* which they contain to the *ſoul of nature!*" We know not whether the reader, after this, will be ſurpriſed to learn, that " in the eye of a ſuperior Being, man's actions upon earth may appear juſt as important, certainly at leaſt as determinate and circumſcribed, as the actions and enterpriſes of a *tree!*" Of the truth of this aſſertion, we confeſs that we are not without our doubts. To the *air*, our author's creator of worlds, a *tree* and a *philoſophical hiſtorian* are indeed of the ſame importance; but we have a ſtrong ſuſpicion, that " the PRINCE of the *power* of the air" is much more intereſted in the enterpriſes of the *philoſopher* than in thoſe of the *tree*.

We paſs over the author's lamentation on the *humiliating manner* in which children are *begotten*; and regret, in our turn, the occaſional defects of his memory. In the former book he traced the human race from one heir who had their reſidence in Aſia. Here he obſerves, much more philoſophically, that " all plants grow wild in ſome part or other of the world. Thoſe, which we cultivate with art, ſpring from the free lap of nature, and arrive at much greater perfection in their proper climes. With animals, and with men it is the ſame: for every race of men, in its proper region, is organized in the manner moſt natural to it. Every ſoil, every ſort of mountains, as well as a like degree of heat and cold, nouriſhes its own plants." Therefore, as men and animals are *plants*, there muſt have been differently organized races of men placed originally in different regions.

We were at ſome loſs to conceive what could have given ſo *rational* and *ſober* a writer ſuch a favourable opinion of the ſcience of *aſtrology*; but the grounds of that opinion are here developed, and ſhewn to be *truly ſolid*.— " The plants of the Cape, in our hot-houſes, bloſſom in *winter*, as then arrives the *ſummer of their native country*. The marvel of Peru bloſſoms at *night*, probably becauſe it is then *day* in America *, whence it originally came!!" Now theſe ſympathies can reſult only from the ſecret influence of the *ſtars*, or at leaſt of the *ſun*, one ſtar, on the plants; and in the diſcovery of this influence conſiſts the ſcience which our author wiſhes to reſtore to its priſtine rank.

Next follows a ſentimental addreſs to the plants—" ſalutary children of the earth!" After which we are told that man is a BEAST, holding the middle rank between the carniverous and graminivorous animals. This ſubject is

---

* The author attributes this reaſon for the nocturnal bloſſoming of the marvel to *Linneus*. We ſhould have the very ſame opinion of it that we have, had its author been Newton, or even Solomon; but we confeſs, that from the manner in which he refers to the tranſactions of the Swediſh academy, which we have not at hand, we have ſtrong ſuſpicions that Linneus has made no ſuch aſſertion.

continued

continued in the third chapter, which treats of *the animal kingdom in relation to the history of man.*

"I muſt here obſerve, once for all," ſays the author, "that man acquired chiefly from BEASTS themſelves, that *information*, which enabled him gradually to obtain his dominion over them. *These* were the living ſparks of the DIVINE UNDERSTANDING, (Q. Were the beaſts or the information derived from theſe ſparks?) the rays of which, as they related to food, habits of life, clothing, addreſs, arts, or inſtincts, he *condenſed* within himſelf from a greater or ſmaller circle." (p. 63.)

It has often been remarked, that the animals peculiar to the new world, have neither the ſtrength nor fierceneſs of thoſe of the old; and various reaſons have been aſſigned for theſe differences, of which we believe, that, till the appearance of the work before us, not one was deemed ſatisfactory by ſober inquirers. Our author, however, ſolves the difficulty with his uſual confidence and uſual ſucceſs.

The American animals "diſengaged themſelves with difficulty *from the warm ſlime*," in which they originally grew, ſome leaving behind them "their *teeth*; others, a *foot* or a *claw*, and others again *the tail*; and hence it is that moſt are deficient in ſize, courage, or ſwiftneſs!!" An account of the origin of animals very ſimilar to this had indeed occurred to certain philoſophers of antiquity, who taught that mother Earth firſt brought forth vaſt numbers of *legs*, and *arms*, and *heads*, &c. which approaching each other, arranging themſelves properly, and being cemented together, *ſtarted up at once full grown men and women.* But the philoſophers of antiquity knew nothing of "the electric ſtream," which their modern diſciples have diſcovered to be an eſſential ingredient in the compoſition of animals; and our author aſſures us, that "the electric ſtream being evidently *wanting* in *America*," this defect in the animals originally mutilated by the tenacity of the ſlime of that continent, is the cauſe of their inferiority to the animals of Aſia, Africa, and Europe!

In the fourth chapter, of which it is the profeſſed object to prove, "that man is a creature of a middle kind among terreſtrial animals," we meet with two very unexpected pieces of information. The firſt is, that "in the eye of the eternal Being, who views all things in one connected whole, perhaps the *form* of the *icy particle*, as it is generated, and the *flake of ſnow* which grows from it, may have an analogous reſemblance to the formation of the *embryo in the female womb!*" and the ſecond, that "no ſooner does the bird approach the earth in a hideous equivocal genus, as in the *bat* and *vampire*, but (then) it reſembles the human ſkeleton!" Theſe are two of the author's proofs that man is a creature of a middle kind; and we are perſuaded that the reader will agree with us in thinking, that they are of themſelves a ſufficient reaſon for the exclamation—"Rejoice in thy ſituation, O man! and ſtudy thyſelf, thou noble middle creature, in all that lives around thee," but more eſpecially in bats and vampires!!

The third book is, like the ſecond, *phyſiological*; but it contains rather PHYSIOLOGICAL HYPOTHESIS than *phyſiological news.* In ſix chapters the author conſiders the *ſtructure of plants and animals*; compares *the various powers that operate in animals*; gives what he calls *examples of the phyſiological ſtructure of ſome animals*; treats of *inſtincts*, which he attributes, not only to *animals*, but alſo to *vegetables*, and even to a STONE *falling by the force of gravity*; conſiders the advancement of the creature from mere vegetable life, to what he calls

calls *a combination* of *ſeveral ideas, and to a particular freer uſe of the ſenſes and limbs*; and conſiders the *organic difference between men and beaſts.*

In this book every thing is attributed to what is termed ORGANIC POWER; but of *organic power* itſelf, the reader will look in vain for an explanation or definition. It ſeems, however, to be the author's meaning, that all the difference between men and beaſts, and even between men and vegetables, results from the ſtructure of their ſeveral parts, and their combination of thoſe parts into one whole; and that the ſeveral *ſenſes*, inſtead of being the *inſtruments* of mind by which it exerts its various propenſities, are the *baſes* of thoſe propenſities themſelves. We ſhall not, however, be poſitive that this is preciſely the author's meaning; for the ſtyle of this book is ſo totally unlike every thing that we have ſeen expreſſive of ſcience, the writings of Kant and his followers alone excepted, that when with no ſmall difficulty we had collected, as we thought, ſome ſenſe from "the burning words," we found, on cloſer inſpection, that we had got hold only of a *cinder*. It is proper, however, that the reader form his own judgment; and this he may ſee from the following paſſage, the moſt luminous and comprehenſive that occurs during the diſquiſition:—

"Nature beſtowed on her living children what ſhe had beſt to beſtow, *an organic ſimilitude of her own creative power, animating warmth.* From inanimate vegetable life the creature produces, by means of certain organs, *living ſtimuli*; and from the ſum of theſe, refined by more exquiſite *ducts*, the medium of *perception*. The *reſult* of ſtimuli is IMPULSE: the reſult of perception is *thought*; an *eternal progreſs of the creative organization* imparted to *every living being*. With its *organic warmth*, not as perceptible externally to our rude inſtruments, the perfection of the ſpecies increaſes; and, perhaps too, its capacity for a more delicate ſenſe of well-being, in the all-pervading ſtream of which the all-warming, all-quickening, all-enjoying mother feels her own exiſtence." (p. 81.)

The ſubject is continued in the fourth book, in which the intellectual and moral ſuperiority of man is attributed wholly to his *erect form*, with the *ſuperior ſize*, and greater *elaboration of his brain*. What is meant by *elaboration of brains* we have no means of diſcovering; and a reader, not accuſtomed to our author's mode of writing, might be tempted to charge him with contradiction or inconſiſtency, when he contends that men are ſuperior to *apes*, and yet affirms, that the *brains* of *ſome apes* equal in ſize and elaboration thoſe of man. The contradiction, however, will be ſeen to vaniſh, when it is known that the CAPACITY OF SPEECH is the SOURCE OF REASON! "It was in being *organized* with a capacity for ſpeech, that man received the breath of the divinity, the ſeed of reaſon and *eternal perfection*, an echo of that creative voice to rule the earth, in a word, *the divine art of ideas*, the mother of all arts." "But the man-like ape is viſibly and forcibly deprived" of ſpeech by the pouches nature has placed at the ſides of the windpipe.

"Why has the father of human ſpeech done this? Why would he not permit the all-imitative ape to imitate preciſely this criterion of human kind, inexorably cloſing the way to it by peculiar obſtacles? Viſit an hoſpital of lunatics, and attend to their diſcourſe; liſten to the jabbering of monſters and idiots, and you need not be told the cauſe. How painful to us is the utterance of theſe! How do we lament to hear the gift of language ſo profaned by thoſe! and how much more would it be profaned in the mouth of the groſs, laſcivious, brutal ape, could he imitate human words, with the half-human underſtanding, which I have no doubt he poſſeſſes!" (Pp. 156, 157.)

Had

Had our author been a Britiſh philoſopher we ſhould not have heſitated to pronounce that here he reaſons in a circle; for if the *dumb* ape poſſeſſes *half human underſtanding*, and if the *capacity of reaſon* be the *ſource of reaſon*, the *ſpeaking* ape, ſo far from profaning language by his groſsneſs and laſciviouſneſs, might have figured among the philoſophers and poets patronized at the court of Weimar by the Ducheſs Dowager, and might, in time, have even ſucceeded Herder as ſuperintendant of the clergy! We dare not, however, urge this objection againſt our author, who being deeply read in the logic of KANT, poſſeſſes the happy talent of reconciling what, to our unphiloſophical heads, has the appearance of a contradiction.

In this book and in the next, which might well be entitled METAPHYSICAL *News*, will be found ſome arguments for the immortality of the human ſoul, which have been often urged with great force; but which are here ſo completely enveloped in the *ſublime* language of KANT, that it requires the utmoſt effort of meaner minds to accompany our author through the detail of them. As ſtated by WOLLASTON and others, the reaſoning built on man's ſuſceptibility of perpetual improvement, in contradiſtinction to the capacities of the inferior animals, which, as *genera* and *ſpecies*, have not advanced one ſtep ſince the beginning of the world, is perfectly intelligible; and ſo would it be, as ſtated by our author, had he not deprived man of an individual and permanent principle of conſciouſneſs. Man's powers are, in his ſyſtem, all organical; and no power in nature can *exiſt* without an organ. He expreſsly declares that he agrees with "Prieſtley and others who have objected to the ſpiritualiſts, that no ſuch thing as pure ſpirit is known in the univerſe; and that we by no means ſee far enough into the nature of matter, to deny it the faculty of thinking, or other ſpiritual qualities." Yet he repeatedly affirms that he is no materialiſt; and ſtigmatizes the opinions of that ſect with the appellation of *miſts* which, before the torch of truth which he holds up to the world, muſt vaniſh for ever!

According to him the *organ of God*, which he deſcribes ſometimes as *electric matter*, ſometimes as *air*, ſometimes as *ether*, ſometimes as the *plaſtic nature* of CUDWORTH; but which ſeems on the whole to be the ANIMA MUNDI of the *ancient ſtoics*, animates every organized ſyſtem on earth, from the cryſtal in the mine to a NEWTON or a SOLOMON. This plaſtic ſubſtance forms the organs of each individual being which it animates, according to certain laws; and combining itſelf variouſly with theſe organs, furniſhes men, for example, with a ſet of *organic powers*, producing *conſciouſneſs*, *reaſon*, *ſenſation*, and *volition*, &c. When the organs are worn out, there is an end of the *man*, but not of the *powers* by which he was animated. Theſe paſs into another ſtate, and animate *more perfect organs*; for power cannot be annihilated, and all powers are in a ſtate of progreſſion. This idea of progreſſion he carries ſo far as ſometimes to ſuppoſe that the ſyſtem of powers, which act in the organs of man, had formerly animated inferior animals, and even vegetables.

"Be it, that we know nothing of our real or pure ſpirit, we deſire not to know it as ſuch. Be it, that it is originally the ſame with all the powers of matter, of irritability, of motion, of life, and merely acts in a higher ſphere, in a more *elaborate and ſubtile organization*, has one ſingle power of motion and irritability been ſeen to periſh? Are theſe inferior powers one and the ſame with their organs? Can he, who introduced an innumerable multitude of *theſe* into my body, and ordained each its form; who ſet my ſoul over them, appointed the ſeat of her operations, and gave her in the nerves, bands by which all

all theſe powers are linked together, want a medium in the great chain of nature to tranſport her out of it? And can he fail to do this, when he has ſo wonderfully introduced her into this organic ſenſe, evidently to form her to a ſuperior deſtination? (p. 201.)

Should the reader not clearly perceive the author's object through the ſmoke raiſed by theſe burning words, let him peruſe with attention the following extracts:

"When the door of creation was ſhut, the forms of organization already choſen remained as appointed ways and gates, by which the *inferior powers* might in future *raiſe* and *improve* themſelves within the limits of nature. New forms ariſe no more: but our powers are continually verging in their progreſs *through thoſe that exiſt*, 'and what is termed organization is properly nothing more than *their conductor to a higher ſtate*." (p. 203.)

"The animal ſtands above the plant, and ſubſiſts on its juices. The ſingle elephant is the grave of millions of plants; but he is a living, operative grave; he *animalizes* them into parts of himſelf: the *inferior powers* aſcend to the more *ſubtile form of vitality*. It is the ſame with all carniverous beaſts. Nature has made the tranſition ſhort, as if ſhe feared a lingering death above all things. The greateſt murderer among all animals is man, the creature that poſſeſſes the fineſt organs. He can *aſſimilate to his nature almoſt every thing* unleſs it ſink too far beneath him in *living organization*. (p. 204.)

"Strip off the outer integument, and there is no ſuch thing as death in the creation: every demolition is but a paſſage to a higher ſphere of life; and the wiſe Father of all has made this as early, quick, and various, as was conſiſtent with the maintenance of the ſpecies, and the happineſs of the creature that was to enjoy its integument, and improve it as far as poſſible. By a thouſand various modes of ending life, he has prevented tedious deaths, and promoted the germe of blooming powers to ſuperior organs. (p. 204.)

"Thus, the ſcale of improvement aſcends through the inferior ranks of nature; and ſhall it ſtand ſtill or retrograde in the nobleſt and moſt powerful? The animal requires for its nutriment only *vegetable powers*, with which it enlivens parts of a vegetable nature." Then, after obſerving that animals prey upon each other's *powers* which are all *ſpiritual*, he adds—"Now, ſince theſe cannot exiſt without *organic grounds*, we are led to conſider the human ſpecies, if we may be allowed a conjecture on this obſcurity of the ſtorehouſe of creation, as the great confluence of *inferior organic powers*, which were to unite in it for the formation of man!" (p. 207.)

"Every thing in nature is connected; one ſtate puſhes forward and prepares another. If then man be the laſt and higheſt link, cloſing the chain of terreſtrial organization, he muſt begin the chain of a higher order of creatures, as its loweſt link, and is probably, therefore, the middle ring between two adjoining ſyſtems of the creation. He cannot paſs into any other organization upon earth, WITHOUT TURNING BACKWARDS, AND WANDERING IN A CIRCLE: that he ſhould ſtand ſtill is impoſſible, ſince no living power in the dominions of the moſt active goodneſs is at reſt: thus there muſt be a ſtep before him, cloſe to him, yet as exalted above him, as he is pre-eminent over the brute, to whom he is at the ſame time nearly allied. This view of things, which is ſupported by ALL THE LAWS OF NATURE, (What a prodigy muſt our author have been?) alone gives us the key to the wonderful phenomenon of man, and at the ſame time to the only *philoſophy* of his *hiſtory*." (p. 225.)

The Monthly Reviewers admit that theſe ſpeculations on coſmogony, geo-

logy, and physiology, are misplaced in a work of which the professed object is an examination of the grounds and principles of *civil* history; but with these gentlemen's permission, we beg leave to affirm, that this is not the whole of Herder's object, which comprehends, as well the *natural* as the *civil* history of man. The speculations, however, are certainly misplaced, and would have been so in any work; for they are a farrago of impious absurdities, for which we are aware of no proper place. But the Reviewers have no unfavourable opinion of the speculations themselves, and only regret that they are out of place.

"The cosmogony of Herder," say they, "is built on a competent knowledge of *facts* developed by preceding writers;" and it must be confessed, that he himself refers to BOYLE, BOERHAAVE, HALES, S. GRAVESENDE, FRANKLIN, PRIESTLEY, BLACK, CRAWFORD, &c. for many discoveries made on heat and cold, on electricity, and on air; but who, that has ever looked into the works of these eminent philosophers, can need to be told that, as their discovered facts bear not the slightest resemblance to his, they can afford no support to his airy theories. BLACK, we may venture to say, would have thought of his theories with contempt, and BOYLE with abhorrence. "But the author," continues the Reviewer, "shews a vividness of imagination and ingenuity, which is requisite in a constructor of theories." If by ingenuity and vividness of imagination, be meant *verbosity*, *ambiguity*, and an *intricate* arrangement of words and sentences, Herder certainly displays these qualities in a superlative degree; and there can be no doubt but such qualities are requisite in a constructor of theories, which being, for the most part, *nonsensical fictions*, would have no charms if exposed to view in their own hideous nakedness.

"Some theologians," says the Reviewer, "may probably accuse the author of being unfriendly to theism, because he ascribes more effect to physical agency than divines have usually allotted." "He does not directly so state it, but it would SEEM that he considered vegetables, animals, and even men, in their first formation, as resulting from natural processes, as effects arising out of the course of nature at a particular crisis: but he may say that this is by no means excluding a creator from the universe; for who endued nature with these sublime generative powers, and who fixed the epoch at which they were to operate?"

True, he may say all this; but who will believe him, after he has taught us that his *organic powers* are ETERNAL; that they are "INDWELLING ORGANIC OMNIPOTENCE;" and that "in the kingdom of supreme wisdom and goodness every thing is connected, and power acts on power in ONE ETERNAL CHAIN?" Herder's system, as far as it is intelligible, is nothing else than the antient PANTHEISM; and we should as soon say "it would SEEM that the monthly Reviewers mete with the same measure to Christians and infidels," as that "it would SEEM that the late superintendant of the clergy of Weimar believed in God as the MORAL Governor of the universe!"

"The notions of an immortal soul," says the Reviewer, "and of an endless happy existence, have often called forth fine and animating declamation; and that which we have perused *in these pages* has not often been excelled." Indeed! Our readers have got a large specimen of this declamation, which was not vouchsafed to the readers of the Monthly Review, the limits of that publication having "obliged the Reviewer to *resist all inclination* to extract *any specimen* of it;" and if it animate *them*, we shall certainly be surprized. Why so, may the Reviewer ask?

"The

"The author's hypotheſis may be ſaid to be free from ſome of the objections to which ſpiritualiſm is liable; and to avoid the languor and frigidity attaching to the ſyſtem of modern materialiſm, which repreſents the mind as in a ſtate of annihilation for an undefined period, namely, that which intervenes between death and the general reſurrection: but it may be aſked, why, when the matter of the organs crumbles, ſhould not the powers diſſipate; why ſhould not the *coherence* of the latter ceaſe, when that of the former terminates; why, when the body periſhes, ſhould not the powers merge in the vaſt reſervoir from which they were taken; or, in the language of ancient philoſophy, why does not the ſoul unite with that univerſal ſpirit, the *anima mundi*, of which it originally formed a part? We cannot, therefore, diſcover that this ſyſtem is on the whole more ſatisfactory than thoſe which it would ſuperſede?"

Pray, Sir, is it *equally* ſatisfactory with the ſyſtem of the GOSPEL which is certainly one of thoſe that it would utterly ſuperſede? The origin of death, and the doctrine of redemption, as taught in the Old and New Teſtaments are altogether irreconcileable with the dreams of Herder; and yet it might here become a Chriſtian critic to compare the theory of a Lutheran *biſhop* with theſe two fundamental articles of the Chriſtian faith, as well as with the opinions of CLARKE and PRIESTLEY.

But we will go a ſtep farther, and affirm, that it is much *leſs* ſatisfactory than either of thoſe opinions. With reſpect to the opinion of Clarke compared with that of Herder, there can be no controverſy among thinking men; and even the doctrine of Prieſtley, when taken entire, is infinitely more comfortable than the ravings of this oracle of Weimar, of whoſe friendſhip ſome of our Preſbyterian divines have been wont to boaſt of as of their greateſt honor! Prieſtley ſuppoſes that the original ſtamina of each man, though material, remains unchanged, without being aſſimilated with the matter either of other animals or of vegetables; and that when new matter ſhall be added to theſe ſtamina, and properly organized at the laſt day, the man will riſe the ſame perſon that he was in this world, with bodily organs, of which the matter was perpetually changing. If this doctrine could be believed, there would be in it nothing uncomfortable; for theſe metaphyſical nurſlings know, or ought to know, that time unperceived is of no duration; and that though a million of years ſhould intervene between death and the reſurrection, the mind when it ſhall wake (for it is not annihilated) will appear to itſelf to have *ſlept* but one inſtant. Upon this hypotheſis then, which aſſuredly is not ours, a future ſtate of *retribution* may be confidently expected by him who believes in the reſurrection of the body, and man muſt ſtill conſider himſelf as under the moral government of God; but on the hypotheſis of Herder, there is *no* moral government of God, and a future ſtate of *retribution* is utterly impoſſible. Since power acts on power in one *eternal chain*, the powers which at preſent animate us, when they paſs into *new organs* and another ſtate, will have as little remembrance of what they did or ſuffered in *human* organs, as they now have of what they did or ſuffered in the organs of *plants* and *oxen*. The Reviewer ſays, that in this part of the work "he meets with practical inferences, and eloquent apoſtrophes." The eloquence is not very brilliant, but the practical inference is moſt obvious; for he who cordially embraces this theory of immortality, muſt perceive that he is under no moral reſtraint whatever.

Much, however, as we abhor ſuch impious abſurdities, we are ſtrongly inclined to hope with the tranſlator, that no *Engliſhman* will attentively read

this part of theſe *outlines of the philoſophy of history*, "without being able to ſay, that he is a happier and a better man." Much of human goodneſs, and almoſt the whole of human happineſs, conſiſt in being content with the ſtate in which Providence has placed each individual; and he, who reflects that the author of this nonſenſe was ſuperintendant of the clergy of a Proteſtant ſtate, eſteemed and careſſed at the court of his Sovereign, muſt have a head and heart ſingularly formed, if he feel not a glow of gratitude more than uſually warm to that Providence which hath placed him in the Britiſh empire, and in the boſom of the Church of England.

(To be continued.)

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR,

YOU have lately opened ſtrong, well appointed, and well ſerved batteries againſt a fortreſs that Jacobiniſm has recently conſtructed, and given to it the name of the Edinburgh Review. The directors of that work by no means acknowledge that it is devoted to the ſervice of Jacobiniſm: no, that would not *at preſent* anſwer the purpoſe; they muſt not, if they would be read, ſpeak in the open ſtyle of their friend Paine, or the Analytical Review. The democratic and diſſenting tribe now make high pretenſions to loyalty, and under that maſk can more ſecurely attack its real friends and ſupporters. From the profeſſions of the Edinburgh Reviewers, and alſo from my thorough knowledge, that all the able literary men of the Scottiſh metropolis are warm friends to the King and Conſtitution, I entertained hopes it might add to the number of valuable works. But in the very firſt number I obſerved many ſtrong objections, which I ſhall not particularize, as the work is in your much abler hands. Indeed had I read no other part of the Edinburgh Review than the article in number three on the account of the Egyptian expedition, I ſhould have been perfectly ſatisfied concerning its ſpirit and wiſhes. The great object of the criticiſm is to ſupport Reynier's account, which, with ſuch groſs and impudent falſhood, denies all military merit to the troops of his Britannic Majeſty. *I could not, and never can think, that the Edinburgh Reviewers, tarniſhing to the utmoſt of their power the atchievements of British heroiſm, are really the votaries of loyalty and patriotism.* They are not ſatisfied with reviling the ſoldiers who were employed in that expedition, but the calumny extended, and ſtill extends to all Britiſh ſoldiers. The reviewer, in the face of our victories, and the complete atchievement of our purpoſe, aſſumes that we did not effect our object, and in his candour pretends to apologize for the failure. "The Engliſh expedition (he ſays) was oppoſed to their *immortals*, to troops covered with trophies and ſcars, who in every new climate had breathed the ſame courage—who had triumphed alike over the tactics of Europe, and the furious crowds of the Eaſt. We were upon an element not natural to us; unſkilful, becauſe we were without experience; and unexperienced, becauſe we had no opportunity of improvement. The whole bent of our genius, our reſources, and our pride, is turned to another ſpecies of glory. In that war we were, and in every war we are, not ſoldiers but diſembarked mariners, dragged out of our ſhips to effect a particular object; *doubtful creatures, hardly ſure of our feet, and expoſed to all the inconvenience of amphibious awkwardneſs.*" Such is the language that this Edinburgh Review *dares* to uſe reſpecting the heroes that fought under Abercrombie

Abercrombie and the whole Britiſh army. To adduce inſtances to prove that Britiſh ſoldiers are not ſuch doubtful, helpleſs, and awkward creatures as this *ſlanderer* repreſents them, would be merely to repeat the moſt ſtriking and ſplendid facts that are recorded in military hiſtory. Will our gallant army ſuffer ſuch calumny? Will the friends of the Britiſh army ſuffer their valiant defenders to be ſo ignominiouſly branded? The reviewing calumniator well deſerves that *every officer in the ſervice ſhould join in reprobating a production which has traduced the whole military body.* I ſhould not, indeed, have been ſurprized *if a motion had been made in the various regiments that none belonging to them ſhould countenance the* EDINBURGH REVIEW *WHICH DEFAMES THE ARMY. Other loyal and patriotic Britons would readily join in proſcribing the Edinburgh Review as a vehicle of ſuch falſe and malignant abuſe againſt the troops of their country*; and if theſe critics had the ſcope of their criticiſm properly expoſed, I have that opinion of the diſcrimination, principles, and ſentiments of the bulk of our countrymen, that I am convinced the Edinburgh Review would ſoon follow the fate of the Analytical, and other productions which were adverſe to their country; and, I truſt, that as one of the firſt glories of the Anti-Jacobin Review was to ſilence the Analytical, it will be equally ſucceſsful in ſilencing the Edinburgh, which croaks the ſame tune, though in a different key. No part of his Majeſty's ſubjects can be more loyal and patriotic than the great majority of the city of Edinburgh, and none, if the caſe were properly impreſſed upon them, would more readily join in diſcountenancing ſuch calumny than the moſt reſpectable citizens and bodies of this metropolis. Theſe all admire your Anti-Jacobin—I truſt from it they will receive a full expoſure of a publication which will certainly ceaſe to be current as ſoon as its ſcope and tendency are pointed out.

As *the object of the Edinburgh Review is the depreciation of whatever tends to elevate, or to ſupport our country*, a natural and obvious branch of their plan is, to vilify every writer who ſupports conſtitutional loyalty, patriotiſm, and order. The mode of execution it varies, but moſt frequently aſſumes the appearance of friendly coincidence. The kind of warfare, however, that it employs againſt the friends of their king and country, in reviewing their works, I ſhall, for the preſent, content myſelf with illuſtrating in one inſtance—The review of a poem entitled, "The Defence of Order."

In the firſt paragraph, the critic expreſſes his ſatisfaction with the political principles of the poem. This ſurprized me exceedingly, for the evident ſpite and malignity which runs through the whole of his ironical attempt, gives him all the appearance of one who is ſore beſet in an argument on politics, and who takes refuge in miſtatement, miſquotation, and falſhood. I cannot help thinking, therefore, that there may be ſome *ſmall* difference in political opinion between the poem and the critic; but admitting that there is none, and that the paſſions of the latter have been irritated only by the lame execution of the former, and by his terror, leſt ſome unworthy foot ſhould treſpaſs on that Parnaſſus, of which he has named himſelf the guardian, let us try to weigh the merit of his animadverſion. His next paragraph implies that the language of the poem is ungrammatical; but, in his heat and agitation, he forgets to cite any examples, which certainly does not add to the credibility of ſuch an aſſertion. He ſubjoins a liſt of obſcure paſſages; and although theſe chiefly conſiſt of detached parts of a train of thought, which, like half ſentences, might be made to appear abundantly nonſenſical, I own I felt no ſuch labour as the critic

ſeems to have ſuffered, in catching the author's meaning. Of the paſſages quoted as ludicrous, but at which I never thought of laughing, till directed by the critic to do ſo, I found only one materially objectionable. Unfortunately, however, for the candour and the credit of this Review, it does not exiſt in the poem, and yet my edition is the ſame with that which is ſpecified as under examination. But this is not only the *pious fraud* into which the indignation of the critic has betrayed him. He ſays Lord Nelſon is compared to a ſmall croſs. This is falſe. He ſays Lieutenant Price is compared to a bomb. This is falſe. He ſays (if any meaning can be extracted from the obſcurity of his wit,) that the conduct of Lord Duncan, at Camperdown, is compared with that of Leonidas at Thermopylæ. This too is falſe. With equal contempt of truth, he ſays, that the perſon to whom the poem is dedicated, is repreſented as relieving the *poor of the parish*, inſtead of the *people of a country*, thus unfairly trying to reduce a very ſplendid to a very ordinary act of munificence. He ſays, further, that the author thinks himſelf dealing out immortality; an inference which his ſingular logic probably drew from the following lines,

> " Yet far from him the raſh abortive aim,
> In *dying* verſe to embalm a deathleſs name:
> His to ſolicit, not confer reward,
> Since here the muſe may exalt the bard;
> And he, by chuſing an immortal theme,
> His periſhable ſtrain awhile redeem."

Thus, in ſeven pages, we have ſix deliberate falſhoods; and are theſe the critics to whom the public truſt for a faithful account of new productions? The Reviewer next complains that the author has praiſed obſcure characters, becauſe living in his own neighbourhood (Perthſhire). How the captor of Malta, and the victor of Camperdown, are to be included in the claſs of *obscure men*, it is for the ſagacity of the critic to explain. If, in a poem of two thouſand lines, and compoſed, as it muſt have been, during the ſhort period of our fugitive peace, there be no worſe rhymes than thoſe which the critic has quoted as the worſt, it is certainly giving it no ſmall praiſe. An Edinburgh Reviewer, I think, ought to know that "claim" forms a perfect rhyme with "Graham," unleſs he chuſes to aſſert that a *Scotch* name ſhould not be pronounced as it is in *Scotland*. On the whole, it appears, that *though entertaining the same political sentiments with the author*, he was as willing to do the poem all the miſchief in his power, as if this had not been the caſe; but, finding a fair examination of it not favourable to his views, he was driven to miſrepreſentation, and to that ſpecies of irony which is a teſtimony of diſpoſition, not of talents; which is too eaſy for genius, and too mean for generoſity to employ; but into which human weakneſs, particularly when ſeconded by concealment, is too apt to fall. I have heard this poem praiſed by men as good, and almoſt as wiſe as the critic himſelf, but the greateſt compliment it has yet received, is the anger of the Edinburgh Reviewers.

Such diſingenuous and fraudulent artifices muſt proceed from a deſign of miſrepreſenting; and, as the attempted ſtrictures, ſerious and jocular, are levelled, without exception, againſt paſſages conducive to the juſt praiſes of the conſtitution, and the chief champions of the country, we may very fairly conclude that it is this tendency which makes them reprobate it by the Edinburgh Review. If the critic merely wiſhed to cenſure literary faults,

faults, he would not have ſoiſted, in expreſſions forged by himſelf, to ſerve as a ground of cenſure againſt the author. He would not have ſneered at Lord Duncan, nor at the nobleman who, by his liberal and judicious importation of corn, ſaved not a ſingle pariſh, but a very populous country from a famine. Such men as Lord Duncan, and the other eminent perſon in queſtion, deſerve and enjoy the praiſes of every well affected man acquainted with their conduct. But the hero of Camperdown, and every other perſon eminent for efforts beneficial to their country, may naturally expect the malignant hatred of the Edinburgh Reviewers, who have, with ſuch groſs and impudent falſhood, calumniated the Britiſh army. Theſe, however, are ſubjects on which I merely touch; the complete expoſure of ſuch diſloyal, unpatriotic, and diſaffected malignity, I, and many others, anxiouſly expect from the Anti-Jacobin Reviewers.

I am, Sir,

With great reſpect,

Your moſt obedient,

And very humble ſervant,

J. B.

Kinloch, Perthshire.
Nov. 19, 1803.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Correſpondence between Lords Redeſdale and Fingal, with Reflections on the Principles, Views, and Conduct of the Irish Papiſts, and ſome ſtrong and important Facts in Illuſtration thereof.

(*Continued from P.* 316.)

ADVERTISEMENT FROM THE AUTHOR.

I HOPE the Public will excuſe my touching again on ſome topics which I diſcuſſed in my laſt, as, on reflection, I am of opinion, that I did not expatiate on them with that energy and copiouſneſs which their importance required.

The great outcry raiſed againſt Lord Redeſdale, for having ſtated, in letters to an individual, ſome ſerious truths, which ſhould be made known to every loyal ſubject of the empire at this critical period, and the concealment of which, by any member of the government, muſt be deemed criminal, proves an alarming influence in the popiſh faction, and an apathy ariſing from a depravation of moral and political principle, in the Proteſtant body, which ſhould awaken the vigilance, and animate the exertions, *of every friend to the Conſtitution*, in its defence.

The reader may form ſome idea of the great confidence which the Iriſh Papiſts have in the ſtrength of their cauſe, and that it muſt ultimately prevail, when I aſſure him, that they had the correſpondence of thoſe noble Lords printed in all the Engliſh and Iriſh newſpapers, by which they have been the heralds of their own diſgrace; and that ſoon after its publication they were heard to boaſt, in the ſtreets of Dublin, in the moſt open and unequivocal manner, that they would occaſion the recal of Lord Redeſdale, which would be a great triumph to their party.

I ſhall now ſhew the reader that Engliſh and Iriſh ſtateſmen were not afraid, at former periods, of ſpeaking their ſentiments freely of Popery, againſt

againſt that inveterate enemy of genuine liberty, and pure religion, and that they were praiſed, and not cenſured, for having done ſo.

William Cecil, Lord Burleigh, one of the wiſeſt ſtateſmen that ever preſided over the affairs of Great Britain, told Queen Elizabeth, ſoon after her acceſſion, "that the ſecurity of her government depended entirely on the affections of her Proteſtant ſubjects, and that the Catholics were her mortal enemies, and believed either that ſhe had uſurped the crown, or was lawfully depoſed by the Pope's bull of excommunication*."

The great Lord Somers, Chancellor of England, ſaid, "thoſe who adhere to the Court of Rome are Papiſts, enemies and traitors to the realm of England, and utterly unfit for any truſt in any Proteſtant country."

Lord Cheſterfield ſaid, in his ſpeech to the Iriſh parliament, on the opening of the ſeſſion of 1745, "The meaſures that have been hitherto taken, to prevent the growth of Popery, have, I hope, had ſome, and will ſtill have greater effect; however, I leave it to your conſideration, whether nothing further can be done, either by new laws, or by the more effectual execution of thoſe in being, to ſecure this nation againſt the great number of Papiſts, *whoſe ſpeculative errors would only deſerve pity, if their pernicious influence upon civil ſociety did not both require and authorize reſtraint.*"

Succeeding viceroys have abſurdly concealed the real ſtate of Ireland from the Britiſh cabinet; and led, partly by ill-grounded timidity, and partly by a love of popularity, † they have gradually yielded to the wiſhes of the Romaniſts, generally accompanied with inſults and menaces to the government, by which they have ſhaken the pillars of the conſtitution, and made Ireland the moſt lawleſs and turbulent country in Europe.

Lord Clare, the predeceſſor of Lord Redeſdale, declared in the Iriſh Houſe of Lords, in the year 1792, that if the Roman Catholics were indulged in their extravagant notions of emancipation, England would be compelled to win Ireland again with the ſword; and the repeal of the penal laws, inſtead of conciliating them, has encouraged their diſaffection ſo much, as to produce the rebellion of 1798, which fulfilled his prediction.

The Right Hon. William Pitt, who has not been ſurpaſſed by any preceding miniſter in abilities and patriotiſm, expreſſed himſelf with can-

---

* Hume, chap. 41. p. 248.

† Spenſer, in his excellent treatiſe on Ireland, where he had been ſecretary to Lord Grey, in Elizabeth's reign, laments this in the following words: "And if I ſhould ſay, there is ſome blame thereof in the principal governors, I think I might alſo ſhew ſome reaſonable proof of my ſpeech. As for example, ſome of them, ſeeing the end of their government to draw nigh, and ſome miſchiefs and troblous practices growing up, which afterwards may work trouble to the next and ſucceeding governor, will not attempt the redreſs or cutting off thereof, for fear they ſhould leave the realm unquiet at the end of their government. And therefore they will not ſeek at all to repreſs the evil, but will, either by granting protection for a time, or holding ſome imparlance with a rebel, or by other like device, only ſmother and keep down the flame of the miſchief, ſo as it may not break out in their time of government."

How truly deſcriptive of the Iriſh government for fifty years paſt!

dour

dour and manly boldneſs on this ſubject, in the Britiſh Senate; and why ſhould the Chancellor of Ireland be cenſured for doing ſo in a private correſpondence?

When Mr. Fox moved for a repeal of the corporation and teſt acts, on the 2d of March, 1790. Mr. Pitt ſaid, after explaining the difference between toleration and perſecution, "that the neceſſity of a certain, permanent, and ſpecifi church eſtabliſhment, rendered it eſſential that toleration ſhould not go to equality, which would endanger the eſtabliſhment, and thence no longer be toleration. The extent of the Right Hon. Gentleman's principles, he ſaid, went to the admittance of every claſs of diſſenters to a full and complete equality, and even to the admittance of thoſe who might conſcientiouſly think it their duty to ſubvert the eſtabliſhed church: and not only to the admittance of Roman Catholics, but Papiſts, properly ſo called; (and he obſerved there was no material difference between the two) the latter acknowledging the ſupremacy of a foreign, though an eccleſiaſtical prince, who, according to the Right Hon. Gentleman, with *all the odious, deteſtable, and dangerous opinions that belonged to his church*, ought not to be kept out of the moſt important and official ſituations, before the commiſſion of ſome overt act againſt the conſtitution, manifeſted by force of arms in the open field, by which the policy of prevention might be done away, and a dangerous door opened to the abſolute ruin of the conſtitution. The point at iſſue was, whether the Houſe ſhould or ſhould not at once relinquiſh thoſe acts which had, by the wiſdom of our anceſtors, ſerved as a bulwark to the church, the conſtitution of which was ſo connected and interwoven with the intereſts and preſervation of the conſtitution of the ſtate, that the former could not be endangered, without hazarding the ſafety of the latter."

As this great ſtateſman muſt be thoroughly convinced, that the opinions which he delivered at that time were well founded, and as ſubſequent events have proved that the principles of papiſts are *as hoſtile to our conſtitution as ever, it is hoped and expected, that he will ſtand forward in its defence*, ſhould Popery ever be brought forward by a Jacobin faction.

I have ever admired and reſpected him, and have given a moſt efficient ſupport to his adminiſtration; let me aſſure him, then, that he has more to dread from *Popiſh Ireland*, than from Jacobin and infidel France.

Let him recollect, that the repeal of the penal laws, inſtead of conciliating, has increaſed the diſaffection of the Iriſh Papiſts, and that they manifeſt their decided hoſtility to the Proteſtant ſtate as ſtrongly as they did in the 16th and 17th centuries, *when they enjoyed the full benefit of the conſtitution*. That for this reaſon the laws can not be executed but with the aid of the military. Let him recollect that the debt of Ireland, at Lady-day 1793, was but 2,344,324l. 7s. 8d. and that it is now increaſed to the enormous amount of fifty-two millions; which has ariſen from the neceſſity of maintaining an immenſe ſtanding army, for the ſuppreſſion of *Papiſh treaſon*. All theſe evils will increaſe with the growth of Popery; and human wiſdom can not remedy them in any other way than by replanting the Proteſtant religion in Ireland, and by extending its bleſſings to every part of it.

The Earl of Clare gave the following opinions, in the Iriſh Houſe of Lords, the 13th of March, 1793, on that fatal bill which granted the elective franchiſe, and many other privileges, to the Iriſh Roman Catholics,

lics. and by which they were put in a much better ſituation than the Engliſh.

" The bill now upon the table has been backed by authority, and is now by authority preſented to us, as a demand of right, by a great majority of the people, who aſſert that your church eſtabliſhment is a prophane uſurpation upon a foreign prince, and claim to be admitted to a full participation of the political powers of the ſtate; by which alone your church eſtabliſhment can be ſupported. If the parliament of Ireland is to liſten to the claims of the Popiſh ſubjects of this country, to be admitted to political power on the ground of right, I deſire to know where we are to m ke a ſtand? Religion is the great bond of ſociety, and therefore in every civilized country there muſt be a religion connected with the ſtate, and maintained by it againſt all attacks and encroachments, and, therefore, I deny the right of any man who diſſents from the religion connected with the ſtate, to demand admiſſion into the ſtate, upon which alone the eſtabliſhed religion can reſt for ſupport. If the principle is once yielded, in my opinion, it goes exactly to the ſubverſion of all civilized government. Should the parliament of Ireland once admit the claims of Iriſh Papiſts to political power, on the ground of right, I deſire to know where we are to draw the line? If Papiſts have a right to vo e for repreſentatives, in a Proteſtant parliament, they have a right to ſit in parliament; they have a right to fill every office in the ſtate; they have a right to pay tithes excluſively to their own clergy; they have a right to reſtore the ancient pomp and ſplendor of their religion; they have a right to be governed excluſively by the laws of their own church; they have a right to ſeat their biſhops in this houſe; they have a right to ſeat a Popiſh prince on the throne; they have a right to ſubvert the eſtabliſhed government; and to make this a Popiſh country, which I have little doubt is their ultimate object; and therefore, if I were to look only to the manner in which this bill has been brought forward, in my judgment we are about to eſtabliſh a fatal precedent in aſſenting to it."

" But if the manner in which it has been brought forward ſtood clear of all exception, ſee whether the principle of the bill can be juſtified by ſound policy. The great argument in ſupport of it has been, that we ought to unite men of all religious perſuaſions in ſentiment, and in ſupport of the preſent conſtitution; if this could be effected, I am free to acknowledge it would be a momentous object; but ſo long as man continues to be a creature of paſſion and intereſt, I ſhall never have any faith in the efficacy of a government founded upon principles of ſentiment and fraternity; and therefore, deſpairing altogether to ſee a renewal of the golden age, I incline ſtrongly, in framing laws for the government of man, to reject ſpeculation, and to abide by experience; and upon this particular ſubject, if I am to look to experience, the annals of Europe do not furniſh an example of Proteſtants and Papiſts agreeing in the exerciſe of political power in the ſame ſtate. This has not been peculiar to Ireland, if we look to England during the whole of the laſt century, if we look to France during five ſucceſſive reigns, if we look to any other nation in Europe, where the reformed religion has found its way, the progreſs of diſcord has been uniformly the ſame. The conteſt has originated in religious perſecution, has proceeded to civil war and maſſacre, and has ended only in the extermination of one or other of the contending ſects. It is impoſſible that mere difference of opinion, upon ſpeculative points of faith,

faith, could have produced effects ſo fatal to the peace of ſociety; and therefore, if we are to trace the evil to its ſource, it will be found to ſpring from the active, enterprizing, and intolerant ſpirit of the Court of Rome, and from the canons and conſtitutions of the Romiſh church, which, under the ſpecious pretext of religious ordinances, are palpably framed for the attainment of unlimited ſecular power to the Pope and his votaries."

"I meddle not with the religious ſpeculative opinion of any Roman Catholic. If he chuſes to ſubſcribe to articles of faith which my reaſon and underſtanding reject, that is his buſineſs, not mine. But I object to all intercourſe and communication with the Court of Rome; I object to the canons and conſtitutions of the Romiſh church, and to the pernicious influence which they have had, and which they always will have, upon the government of every Proteſtant ſtate, which is not fully and effectually guarded againſt it."

"The cheat, by which the Court of Rome heretofore impoſed upon the ignorance and credulity of Ireland, is a claim of univerſal and unlimited ſpiritual power in every Chriſtian ſtate, derived to the Pope, by divine commiſſion, and paramount therefore to all civil inſtitutions: a power delegated by our Saviour to St. Peter, whom they call Prince of Apoſtles, and by him tranſmitted, in regular ſucceſſion, to every man who has been elected by the college of cardinals to the Papal Chair; and under colour of this monſtrous impoſition, which, one would ſuppoſe, needs ſtatement only for detection, has the Court of Rome, for centuries, embroiled in civil diſſentions every nation of Europe, which has embraced the reformed religion, and to which her pernicious influence has extended. The corner ſtone of her policy has been to promulgate articles of religious faith, which neceſſarily gave to the Pope a very great degree of ſecular power in every ſtate, acknowledging his ſpiritual ſupremacy; and having laid this foundation, the laws of their church proceed to denounce as heretics, and ſchiſmatics, every ſect of Chriſtians who preſume to diſſent from any one article of religious faith promulgated by the holy fathers.

"I have already ſtated, that the domeſtic tranquillity of this country, during the preſent century, was in a great degree to be attributed to the old Popery laws, which had diſabled the native Iriſh from embarraſſing the Britiſh government, or renewing hoſtilities againſt the Engliſh ſettlers. But there was one other cauſe, to which it muſt alſo be attributed, and to which we muſt always look for maintaining peace and good order in this country. From the revolution down to the year 1782, the ſyſtem adopted by that body of the people, in whom the power and property of the nation had centered, was to cement the connection which had ſo long ſubſiſted between Great Britain and Ireland to their mutual advantage, and to cultivate the confidence and affection of the Britiſh nation; but in the year 1782, a new ſcene was opened in Ireland."

He then ſtates the progreſs and effects of repealing the penal laws, which has been productive of ſo many calamities. "The avowed object, at this day, of Iriſh reformers and Catholic emancipators, is ſeparation from Great Britain; and if they ſhall ſucceed in their hopeful projects, ſeparation or war muſt be the inevitable iſſue."

"I do not know how this proceeding may ſtrike other men, but the avowed exiſtence of a foreign juriſdiction, in the heart of this country, governed by the laws of a foreign prince, evidently framed for the ſubverſion

ſion of all Proteſtant ſtates, is to me a ground of the moſt ſerious alarm; and the wildneſs with which we are now proceeding, in the modern philoſophical ſyſtem of Catholic emancipation, has very much encreaſed my apprehenſions of the danger ariſing from it: if this bill ſhall receive the royal aſſent, I muſt from that moment conſider the Popiſh religion as virtually eſtabliſhed by law in Ireland."

"The number of Popiſh prieſts maintained in this country certainly exceeds two thouſand; I have heard them calculated at two thouſand five hundred; and it ſeems well worthy of conſideration, that this great body of eccleſiaſtics, exerciſing unbounded authority over their flocks, acknowledging an eccleſiaſtical power in a foreign prince, and recognizing, in their fulleſt extent, the laws of a foreign ſtate, is to be eſtabliſhed by law, and let looſe upon this country, totally free from all eccleſiaſtical controul, and diſclaiming the authority of the temporal tribunals upon any ſubject, involving in it the intereſts of their religion. If any man doubts that the Popiſh clergy deny the authority of the temporal courts, to this extent, let me refer him to the recent conduct of the pariſh prieſts of a ſouthern county. They were ſummoned in the laſt ſeſſion of parliament, to give evidence in a ſecret committee of the Houſe of Commons, in order to diſqualify a number of perſons of their own communion, who had voted at the general election, for the gentleman who had been returned one of the repreſentatives of the county; to a man they refuſed to ſubmit to the juriſdiction of the committee, or to give evidence before it. And to the ſcandal and reproach of the tribunal which they had thus inſulted, they were ſuffered to depart triumphantly; I do believe at the interceſſion of the gentleman at whoſe inſtance they had been ſummoned, who entertained well-founded apprehenſions, that if the Houſe of Commons had proceeded to puniſh their contumacy, he would have been murdered on his return home."

Lord Fingal, in inſiſting on Catholic loyalty and allegiance, ſays, "ſurely, my Lord, ſolemn pledges and diſtinguiſhed acts of loyalty are the beſt proofs that can be given," meaning of the fidelity of the Iriſh Romaniſts; but when, or on what occaſion, did they give any proofs of loyalty? Was it in negociating with Francis I. againſt their liege ſovereign, in 1523; or in offering the kingdom of Ireland to him in 1545? Was it by inviting five Spaniſh armies to invade it, and by joining them, in the reign of Elizabeth? Was it by keeping their native country in a conſtant ſtate of rebellion while ſhe ſat upon the throne, in obedience to the Pope's bulls and epiſtles? Did not the Popiſh inhabitants of all the principal towns in Ireland endeavou to aſſaſſinate the perſons who attempted to proclaim James I. on his acceſſion, and did they not aſſign as their motive for ſo doing, that he was not a Papiſt? Did not Sir Cahir O'Dogherty raiſe a dreadful and deſtructive rebellion in his reign, in which the city of Derry was plundered and burnt, and its Proteſtant inhabitants were maſſacred? Did not Tirone and Tyrconnel, who had been frequently guilty of high-treaſon, and always pardoned, enter into a conſpiracy againſt the ſtate, in this monarch's reign, after their guilt had been remitted, they were apparently reconciled to the ſtate, and they were reinveſted with their honours and eſtates? Was not the woeful rebellion of 1641 kindled by the Popiſh clergy, and on the ſcore of religion? During its exiſtence, did not the confederate Catholics of Kilkenny, who aſſumed the forms and the functions of Parliament, offer Ireland to the Pope, the

Kings

Kings of France and Spain, and the Duke of Lorrain; and did they not inveſt the latter with it by a deed duly executed? Did not that aſſembly declare war by fire and ſword againſt the Marquis of Ormond, the King's viceroy? Did they not at laſt expel him from the kingdom, by prevailing on their clergy to excommunicate ſuch perſons as ſhould remain faithful to him? In conſequence of which all his adherents, and even his own relations, who were Papiſts, deſerted him. Did not friar Ponce, in his anſwer to Beling, boaſt of this in the following words, "that they did expel the Lord Lieutenant, and forced him away, as much as a man is forced to caſt the goods out of a ſinking ſhip, leaſt he ſhould periſh with them? It is true, he proceeds, Ormond might have ſtaid, but nobody would have obeyed him, after the excommunication of the prelates; and therefore, we may truly ſay that we compelled him to go."

I give the reader the ſubſtance of this excommunication, which is replete with treaſon, duplicity, and the groſſeſt calumnies.

"For the prevention of theſe evils, and that the kingdom may not be utterly loſt *to his Majeſty*, and his Catholic ſubjects, this congregation of archbiſhops, biſhops, and other prelates and dignitaries of both clergies of this kingdom, found ourſelves *bound in conſcience*, after great deliberation, to declare againſt the continuance of his Majeſty's authority, in the perſon of the Marquis of Ormonde, having by his miſgovernment, ill conduct of his Majeſty's army, and breach of public faith with the people, in ſeveral particulars of the articles of peace, rendered himſelf incapable of continuing that great truſt any longer, for which we will join with other members of this kingdom, in drawing a charge againſt him. And we do hereby manifeſt to *the people*, that they are no longer obliged to obey the orders and commands of the ſaid Marquis of Ormonde, but are, until a general aſſembly of the nation can be conveniently called together, unanimouſly to ſerve againſt *the common enemy*, for the defence of the Catholic religion, his *Majeſty's intereſt*, their liberties, lives, and fortunes, in purſuance of the oath of aſſociation, and to obſerve, in the mean time, *the form of government the ſaid congregation ſhall prescribe*, until otherwiſe ordered by an aſſembly, or until upon application to his Majeſty, he ſettle the ſame otherwiſe. And we do fulminate the annexed excommunication, of one date with this declaration, againſt all oppoſers of the ſaid declaration. James-town, 12th of Auguſt, 1650."* Here we find a ſtriking proof of the unbounded and dangerous influence of the Popiſh clergy, who uſurped all the powers of the ſtate, and formed a theocracy ſimilar to that which prevailed among the Jews. Can we be ſurpriſed, then, that Lord Fingal ſhould yield implicitly to them on this occaſion?

Did they not, in a moſt treacherous manner, iſſue this excommunication ſubſequent to, and in violation of, the peace concluded with the Viceroy, in the year 1648, and in which they declared, "that they freely put themſelves and their power into his Grace's hands?"

Did not that treaſonable aſſembly, during their ſeſſion, reſolve, "that no temporal government or juriſdiction ſhould be aſſumed, kept, or executed, in Ireland, or in any province or county thereof, other than what ſhould be approved, or inſtituted, by their general aſſembly?'

---

* Borlaſe.

After

After a peace concluded with the Viceroy in 1646, did they not attempt, by a degree of treachery unparalleled but by themſelves, to cut off him and his army, when they marched out of Dublin, on the ſecurity and confidence of that peace?

That ſame year, did not the council and congregation of the confederate Catholics of Ireland oblige their general, Preſton, by a ſolemn oath, in theſe words, "to exerciſe all acts of hoſtility againſt the Lord Marquis of Ormonde and his party; and to help, adviſe with council, and aſſiſt in that ſervice, the lieutenant-general of Ulſter, employed in the ſame expedition?" All this time they continued to expreſs, in their manifeſtoes, the *moſt inviolable loyalty to the King* After having ſeized the ſtrongeſt forts in the kingdom, they declared, "that they were ready to yield them up at his Majeſty's command, when a courſe ſhould be taken to ſecure them, *and the Proteſtants of the kingdom, his only true and loyal ſubjects, againſt the factious and ſeditious Puritans.*"* It is obſervable, that at this time they were maſſacring Proteſtants of every deſcription; and they had united with the Puritans, previous to the rebellion, to encreaſe the diſtractions of the ſtate †

After ſuch proofs of diſloyalty and treachery to the King, they manifeſted an inviolable attachment to the republic, for they preſented two addreſſes to the Rump parliament, one in 1652, the other in 1653, in which the following paragraphs are to be found: "That they did readily ſubject and put their conſciences, lives, and fortunes, as in a ſanctuary, under the protection of this commonwealth, having ever ſince walked peaceably, and in due conformity to the government, without the leaſt defection therein: that contrary to your *known pious intentions*, manifeſted in the ſaid act for ſettling Ireland, they do apprehend, that they may be poſtponed or neglected: that ſeveral of the petitioners are able to make appear their *conſtant good affection and adherence to the Commonwealth*,* for whom a competent time to be allowed to make out the ſame is moſt humbly ſupplicated."§

Theſe petitions were preſented by the agents of the Iriſh, at the door of the Houſe of Commons in England, and entered by the clerk of the Rump.

It has invariably happened, that Roman Catholics have been republicans under a Proteſtant ſtate. That axiom, that no perſon can be ſubject to political power, or in any manner whatſoever put under the bonds of ſociety, without his own conſent, (an axiom which, if carried rigidly into practice, would ſhake the foundations of civil ſociety,) was firſt invented by the Popiſh ſchoolmen, for the purpoſe of raiſing the Papal power over that of kings; as by degrading the latter below that of the people, over whom the Romiſh clergy had an unbounded aſcendancy, the Court of Rome, through the prieſthood, eſtabliſhed a complete tyranny over both. In the year 1648, a book was publiſhed in England, entitled, "Several ſpeeches delivered at a conference, concerning the power of parliament to proceed againſt their King for miſgovernment, licenced by Gilbert Mabbot." This was taken, word for word, from a book written by Parſons

---

* Leland, vol. III. p. 74, 122.
* Who cut off the King's head.
† They did ſo in 1798.
§ Lord Orrery's State Letters.

the

the Jeſuit, on the ſucceſſion to the crown of England, which was levelled againſt the title of Queen Elizabeth. Thus the fanatic levellers, who put Charles I. to death, found a direct ſanction for their republican principles, in that pious father's book, written ſeventy years before; the confederate Catholics aſſembled at Kilkenny, during the rebellion of 1641, were in every reſpect a republic.

Doctor Nalſon, in his impartial collection of State Affairs, vol. 1. p 3, tells us, " that the covenanters (republicans), in their ſermons and ſeditious pamphlets, made uſe of the maxims of the Jeſuits, the very phraſe and ſtyle of Becanus, Scioppius, Eudæmon Johannes,* and tranſcribed arguments verbatim out of Bellarmine and Suarez, endeavouring, with thoſe, and Jeſuitical fables, falſe reports, propheſies, and pretended inſpirations, to delude the populace, and unhinge them from their loyalty and allegiance.

During the conſpiracy and rebellion of 1798, the Popiſh prieſts made uſe of phropheſies, as a moſt ſucceſsful expedient to rouſe and animate the popiſh multitude.

I will now give ſome ſtriking inſtances of Catholic allegiance and loyalty, in the reign of Charles II. Soon after his Majeſty's reſtoration, the Iriſh Papiſts preſented a remonſtrance to him, ſtating their great loyalty, their ſufferings, and their perſecution in conſequence of it, and the cruelty and injuſtice of depriving them of their eſtates, under a pretence of their having forfeited them.

It was couched in very ſtrong terms, and it prayed that they may be reſtored to their eſtates, with as much aſſurance as if they had never violated their allegiance. The falſity and impudence of this remonſtrance having alarmed the Proteſtants, they ſolicited his Majeſty, that there might be a fair hearing allowed at the conncil-board, by deputies on both ſides. This reaſonable requeſt was granted, and a day of hearing was accordingly appointed. The deputies on the part of the Proteſtants were the Earls of Orrery and Montrath, and ſix more. Sir Nicholas Plunket† was the leader and prolocutor of the Popiſh commiſſioners. His Majeſty, the Chancellor, the Duke of Ormonde, and ſeveral perſons of the firſt rank attended on the occaſion. After Sir Nicholas Plunket had expatiated, in a florid ſpeech, on the loyalty and the ſufferings of his brethren, he was anſwered by Sir James Barry, who ſet forth their treaſonable conduct, their barbarous and execrable maſſacres, of which he had been in ſome degree an eye-witneſs. When they had finiſhed, the Earl of Orrery produced three papers, ſubſcribed by Sir Nicholas Plunket and the Popiſh deputies, when member of the confederate Catholics of Kilkenny. The Duke of Ormonde, who knew their hand-writing, declared that they were ſubſcribed by them; and they, on being queſtioned, acknowledged their ſignatures. They were then read in ſucceſſion before the council-board; when it appeared, that the firſt, made by the ſupreme council at Kilkenny, was an order wherein they unanimouſly reſolved to proſecute Or-

---

* Theſe were Jeſuits who taught the moſt peſtilent doctrines, ſuch as king-killing, the nullity of oaths, &c. &c.

† He was ſpeaker, and a moſt active member of the confederate Catholics at Kilkenny.

monde,

monde, the King's viceroy, and his party, with fire and ſword. The ſecond was an inſtrument offering Ireland to the Pope; and if he refuſed, to the King of Spain: and if he refuſed, to the King of France; and if he refuſed, to the Duke of Lorrain. This was after the peace of 1648, which they ſuddenly and treacherouſly violated.

The third was a petition, in which they acknowledged the ſupreme authority to be juſtly and lawfully lodged in the Rump parliament.

On this Lord Orrery obſerved, that theſe men were likely to make good ſubjects, who offered to give away their kingdom from his Majeſty. The King, after making ſome pertinent remarks on theſe papers, publicly declared "he was infinitely ſatisfied that the Iriſh deſerved their ſufferings," and ſharply reproved the deputies for daring to appear before him with ſo much guilt upon them, and forbad them for ever his preſence and court.*

The King acknowledged, in the following words, in his printed declaration for the ſettlement of Ireland, "that our good ſubjects, the Proteſtants, not uſurpers, as the Iriſh in their caſe entitle them, in our kingdom of Ireland, have borne a very good part in the bleſſing of our reſtitution, and that they were early in their dutiful addreſſes unto us, and made the ſame profeſſions of a reſolution to return to their duty and obedience to us, during the time of our being beyond the ſeas, which they have ſince ſo eminently made good."

I ſhall now give the reader ſome ſpecimens of Catholic loyalty and allegiance in the reign of Charles the Second, extracted from the ſtate letters of the Earl of Orrery, lord preſident of Munſter, addreſſed to the Duke of Ormonde, viceroy of Ireland, with the reſpective dates of thoſe letters. Theſe extracts will convince the reader that the preſent ſtate of Ireland reſembles ſtrongly what it was at that period; and that, according to the aſſertions of Lord Fingal, Dr Troy, and Mr. Francis Plowden, *the principles of Popery are always the ſame.*

In a letter of the 16th of April, 1662, on enliſting the Iriſh natives, he ſays, "whether it were not requiſite, as ſoon as might be, to raiſe men in Ireland for his Majeſty's ſervice abroad, and for the ſervice of his friends and allies; by which a double advantage will be gained, of ſending away dangerous perſons while at home, and uſeful perſons while abroad." In a letter of the 26th of February, 1661, he urges the policy and neceſſity of admitting none but Proteſtants into the corporations, and ſays, "that the Papiſts could not have rebelled had this been adhered to. The Iriſh rebels in the towns of Wexford and Dungarvan were ſupplied with powder and ammunition from Rochelle."

In a letter of March the 1ſt, 1663, he ſays that robberies and murders were frequently committed on the Engliſh by the Iriſh. They come vizarded, about the fall of night, into the Engliſhmen's houſes, and ſurpriſing them, bind them, and rob them of all they have†. I believe, if where any

* Harris's Fiction Unmaſked, and Life of Lord Orrery, prefixed to his State Letters.

† Spencer obſerves on the common people of Ireland, who lived in huts, called Booleys in his time, they grow thereby the more barbarous, and live more licentiouſly, than they could in towns, uſing what manner they

any ſuch robberies were committed, the prieſt of that pariſh (for every pariſh has a Romiſh prieſt, and never were they ſo numerous or more inſolent) was ſecured,* till, by his influence on his flock, the robbers were diſcovered, it would prevent many of thoſe miſchiefs. I know this is not legal; but if ſomething equivalent be not ſpeedily done, the whole plantations of Ireland will be deſtroyed without a rebellion."†

This practice became ſo common afterwards, that a law paſſed, to levy the damages ſuſtained in the night by the Proteſtants, on the popiſh inhabitants of the vicinage.

By a letter of 5th June 1666, it appears, that in an Iriſh veſſel which came into Limerick river, from Gallicia in Spain, laden with oranges and lemons, and with two pieces of ordnance on the deck, twelve great guns, ready mounted, were found concealed in the hold.

In the ſame letter it is ſaid that the Iriſh had frequent meetings, in order to make preparations for a riſing, as they expected that the French would land a numerous body of forces in Ireland, that ſummer; that there "was a great meeting of the Iriſh clergy, upon the arrival of one Harris, an Iriſh Jeſuit, ſent from their pretended primate, Reily, out of France; that conſiderable meetings were to be in the four provinces, this month, to hear the ſaid Jeſuit's meſſage and advices, and from him the aſſurance of the ſpeedy landing of forces, arms, and ammunition, with money in the weſt." The Earl ſays, "I ſhall have one at their intended meeting at Macroone, which is the meeting place appointed for this province." "I can aſſure your Grace, on good authority, that under *the cloak of pious uſes*, many great ſums have been lately raiſed, eſpecially in the weſt of this province, by the popiſh clergy; inſomuch that poor ſervants have been compelled to pay their ſhillings and ſixpences.‡ What your pleaſure is ſhould be done herein, I humbly deſire to receive, for I doubt, to raiſe a rebellion again, or to help an invaſion, will be thought pious uſes by ſuch people." In the ſame letter it is ſtated, that a riſing was expected in Clare, from *the ill inclinations* of the people in that county. By a depoſition made before Lord Orrery, the 17th of June 1666, it appears that a plan of an inſurrection was formed in the provinces of Leinſter and Connaught, and that they were to riſe in the province of Connaught on the arrival of five ſhips loaded with arms and ammunition, purchaſed by primate Reily, and the reſt of the Romiſh clergy. They were to ſeize all the ſerviceable horſes in the country, and to join the French with them. They prepared a quantity of pike-heads and ſpears.

---

they liſt, and practiſing what miſchiefs and villanies they will, either againſt the government there, by their combinations, or againſt private men, whom they malign, by ſtealing their goods, or murdering themſelves,

* Sir Charles Roſs, who commanded in part of Munſter in 1799, made the popiſh prieſts anſwerable for the enormities committed by their flocks, which kept his diſtrict perfectly quiet.

† This was exactly the practice of the white boys, right boys, defenders, and united Iriſhmen.

‡ By the report of the ſecret committee of the Houſe of Lords in 1793, it appears that levies of money were made in the ſame manner, ſo early as the year 1792, by the Catholic committee.

By letters of June 22d and July 11th 1666, we find that the Engliſh or Proteſtants had been all diſarmed. This was done by the contrivance and the agents of the Duke of York, afterwards James II. By letter of Jan. 11th, 1666, it appears, that there was at this time an army and a fleet at Breſt, ready to ſail for Ireland, and that a large ſquadron of Dutch men of war had ſailed to join them. In a letter of the 11th July, 1666, he ſays "he is confident, that ſhould the French invade Ireland a rebellion will enſue;" and he ſtates this in various letters. Some of the Engliſh turned to maſs, and being upbraided with it, they declared, "that they did ſo to preſerve themſelves;" ſee letter of 19th October, 1666. The ſame thing occurred during the rebellion of 1798; for anonymous letters were ſent to Proteſtants, denouncing their deſtruction, unleſs they became converts; and in ſome places they, from the ſame motive, continue to go to maſs. In the ſame letter he complains of the inſolence of the popiſh clergy, eſpecially ſince the burning of London. He ſays, "I ſhall give your lordſhip ſome inſtances. They have lately ſet up ſeveral ſchools, which their Jeſuits publicly teach in; tho' I know they are the beſt ſchoolmaſters in the world, yet it is to be doubted they teach their ſcholars more than their books, and imbue them with ill principles." In our times, *proh pudor!* a college has been erected, and endowed at an immenſe expence, at Maynooth, in the county of Kildare, by the proteſtant ſtate, for the education of popiſh prieſts; and in the year 1795, when the Romaniſts were in actual rebellion, and had an ambaſſador at Paris, negotiating for the aſſiſtance of the French.*

The Earl of Orrery was ſo much afraid that the popiſh multitude, going to market in the corporate towns, would riſe, ſeize on, and demoliſh them, that he ordered the officers to have the markets kept outſide them;† letters of the 15th June and 2d July 1667. In the former he expreſſes his fears, that when the rebellion takes place, the roads from Munſter to Dublin will be obſtructed: an incident which took place in the year 1798. There is not a doubt but that the Duke of York was privy to, and endeavoured to promote this conſpiracy in Ireland, and the landing of the French there, in order to promote popery and extinguiſh the proteſtant religion. The reader will find inconteſtible proofs of this in the ſecret conſults and intrigues of the Romiſh party in Ireland, State Tracts, Vol. III. p. 626, publiſhed in London in 1707. It ſtates that the king and council having diſcovered "that there were deſigns of introducing popery in Ireland,

---

* The Pope and Roman Catholic princes of Europe conſpired to overturn the government of that arch-heretic queen Elizabeth; and knowing that they could not accompliſh it, without ſending into England a conſtant ſupply of popiſh prieſts, they erected, and endowed, ſeminaries at the following places, for the education of Engliſh and Iriſh prieſts excluſively: Valladolid, Salamanca, Alcola, Douay, Louvain, Rome, Rheims, and Prague. During the firſt twelve years of her reign no perſon was moleſted on account of religion; but the influx of prieſts, bred at theſe ſeminaries, having occaſioned many treaſonable combinations, and aſſaſſination plots, againſt her life, induced a neceſſity of enacting ſevere penal laws. It is ſingular that Engliſh ſtateſmen ſhould follow the example of the Pope and the king of Spain in erecting a ſeminary for popiſh prieſts.

† A conſpiracy was formed in 1798 to ſeize Derry in this manner.

pitched

pitched upon the Duke of Ormond as the only pilot for that kingdom in a ſtorm; and accordingly he was ſent over in the year 1667."

"The Duke of York did not then think it ſeaſonable to oppoſe it, though he was conſcious it was fatal to his deſign. But, however, he wrought ſo powerfully with the king, that orders were given to raiſe men in Ireland, under the notion of foreign ſervice. They were all compoſed of the natives of the kingdom, except ſome proteſtant officers, fit to make Catholics of. The Duke of Ormond would give them no arms, ſo they were exerciſed with ſticks;* and in a little time the plot in England was diſcovered, and they were all diſbanded. Upon which a diſcovery was made by the Iriſh of the popiſh conſpiracy in Ireland; and it is remarkable, that in the whole diſcovery not one Proteſtant appeared as an evidence againſt the papiſts. A pregnant inſtance of the great impartiality and equal demeanour of the Engliſh towards the natives."† But I paſs from theſe reflections, upon the carriage of the Duke of Ormond and the Proteſtants, to a courſe of affairs relating to the whole plot in Ireland; upon the diſcovery whereof, orders came from England to diſarm the papiſts, but they received ſuch timely notice of the deſign, by their creatures at court, that there were not found two hundred arms in all Ireland, the Iriſh having a contrivance of concealing their arms, by thruſting them into bogs, filling the barrels of their guns with butter, which ſuffers them not to take any harm; and as for the locks, they can eaſily hide them.‡ The Lord Brittas and others made their eſcape to France, but the Earl of Tyrone was taken, and committed to Gate Houſe; Sheridan was ſeized in London, but nothing could be proved againſt him. Talbot, now Tyrconnel,§ was confined a priſoner in the caſtle of Dublin, together with his brother, the titular Biſhop of Dublin. The Duke of York went for Flanders; which made the Iriſh even to deſpair, and made one of their Lords to declare, with a great oath, *that he believed Jeſus Chriſt was a Proteſtant, for that nothing they could do did proſper*."‖ Coleman the Jeſuit, who had been an inſtrument of the Duke of York, in promoting the Popiſh intereſt in England, and who was afterwards hanged in 1678, came to Ireland, and was an active agent in forwarding the progreſs of this plot.

In the year 1672, a conſpiracy was diſcovered, to maſſacre the Proteſtants in Dublin; and it appeared afterwards that it extended to Munſter. "The prieſts (by directions from their ſuperiors) ordered their ſeveral congregations, at maſs, that at ſuch a time every Roman Catholic ſhould fix over his door a croſs made of ſtraw."¶ This was to diſtinguiſh them from the Proteſtants. It appears that vaſt multitudes of prieſts came to Ireland from foreign parts about this time, to aſſiſt in forwarding this infernal deſign."*

---

* He knew the extent and malignity of the plot, which was ſoon to explode, and that they were to have joined in the inſurrection.

† Ibid. ‡ The ſame practice took place in the years 1797 and 1798.

§ A furious fanatic, created a Duke and made Viceroy by James II. He perſecuted the Proteſtants, and went great lengths in overturning the eſtabliſhed church. ‖ Ibid.

¶ On the night of the 23d of May, 1798, the doors of the Proteſtants were marked, and men were diſcovered in the act of marking them.

* Secret conſults, in State Tracts, vol. III.

Lord Fingal mentions, as a ſtriking proof of Catholic loyalty, the addreſs of Doctor Coppinger, titular Biſhop of Cloyne, to his flock, which recently appeared in the newſpapers, and the late exhortation of Doctor Troy in Dublin.

Nothing affords a more incontrovertible proof of the duplicity and diſſimulation of the Catholic body, than the exhortations of their clergy, the loyal addreſſes, the numerical oaths of allegiance and remonſtrances of the laity; and in the latter there is commonly to be found, after a conſpiracy has exploded into rebellion, an attempt to gloſs it over by a pretext of *jealouſies and fears* of being maſſacred, a long liſt of grievances, aſſurances of loyalty, and hopes, in conſideration thereof, of being admitted to a full participation of the conſtitution.*

Thus after the Lords Juſtices had ſhewn the utmoſt confidence in the Lords and gentlemen of the pale, in 1641, by ſupplying them with arms, ſoliciting their advice and aſſiſtance in Council, and by giving them commiſſions of martial law, and every poſſible mark of truſt, they kept aloof, becauſe, as they ſaid, they were afraid of being maſſacred; and they ſoon after turned thoſe very arms, which they had thus obtained from government, againſt it. The fears which the rebels expreſſed in 1798, of being maſſacred by the Orangemen, were in the ſame manner diſſeminated, to palliate their deſigns, and to rouſe and irritate the multitude. In a convent of Franciſcans at Multifarnam, where a number of Romiſh prieſts aſſembled, on the 3d of March 1641, to form the plan of that rebellion, they firſt agreed, "that their loyalty to his Majeſty ſhould be ſtill reſerved."

The Cavan rebels ſent a remonſtrance, expreſſive of their loyalty to the Lords Juſtices, in which they requeſted to be recommended by them to his Majeſty, "and that there ſhould be a ceſſation of all things, until the return of their Lordſhip's anſwer; and yet at that time they were muſtering their forces, ſummoning all perſons from ſixteen to ſixty, to meet the Monday following at Virginia, about twelve miles from Cavan.

Soon after the rebellion broke out, the Lords Taaff and Coſtelloe preſented a remonſtrance to the Lords Juſtices, on the part of the gentry and inhabitants of the county of Longford, after they had been ſome weeks in open rebellion, and had committed dreadful enormities. This remonſtrance, which Borlace properly calls *a rebellious and ſcandalous letter*, was full of pretended grievances, and unreaſonable demands. Theſe are to be found in Temple and Borlace.† The parliament aſſembled the 16th of November, 1641, and the Lords Juſtices were induced to convoke them ſo ſoon, at the earneſt inſtance of ſome of the Popiſh members, who ſaid that the deferring it "would be an injury to the whole nation, as hindering them from expreſſing their *loyal affections to his Majeſty, and ſhewing their deſires to quell this dangerous rebellion.*" And yet this party, among whom Patrick Darcy, and Nicholas (afterwards Sir Nicholas) Plunket took the lead, were deeply involved in it, and were afterwards members of that treaſonable aſſembly, the confederate Catholics of Kilkenny.‡

---

* This was the caſe after the exploſions in 1798 and 1803: for after both, the Iriſh Papiſts preſented ſuch addreſſes, which were a mockery of, and an inſult to, our gracious Sovereign.

† Temple, Borlace, and Leland.

‡ Darcy ſat as a Maſter in Chancery in the upper houſe of this aſſembly. Plunket, afterwards knighted by the Pope, when ſent as Ambaſſador to him, was prolocutor in it.

Lord

Lord Coſtelloe, ſoon after delivering the remonſtrance of the Longford rebels to the Lords Juſtices, went to England, and preſented one to the King, on the part of his brethren, at that time in open rebellion; and yet they gave him private inſtructions to move, "that no forces might be ſent out of England, but that the whole work might be left to the remonſtrants, and that they would then undertake to ſuppreſs the rebels themſelves."

The following facts prove their baſe duplicity, that Hugh Oge M'Mahon, a rebel leader, who was arreſted in Dublin the 23d of October, the night on which the inſurrection was to have taken place, confeſſed, "*that all the Lords and gentlemen in the kingdom that were Papists, were engaged in this plot*, that on that very day all the forts and ſtrong places in Ireland would be taken, that the Lord M'Guire, and ſeveral other Iriſh gentlemen, were come up expreſsly to ſurpriſe the caſtle of Dublin, and that twenty men out of each county in the kingdom were to be there to join them.* His evidence was confirmed by Owen O'Conolly, who freely and voluntarily declared that ſaid M'Mahon had owned to him, that the Iriſh had prepared men in all parts of the kingdom, to deſtroy all the Engliſh inhabiting there, to-morrow morning, by ten of the clock; and that in all the ſea ports, and other towns in the kingdom, all the Proteſtants ſhould be killed this night, and that all the poſts that could be, could not prevent it."

Lord M'Guire acknowledged that he knew of this plot, as early as the month of January, 1640; that application had been made to the Pope, and the Kings of France and Spain, for aſſiſtance, and in particular, that the conſpirators had treated with Cardinal Richelieu. That the Lords and gentlemen of the pale were privy to, and concerned in it, and that ſome Popiſh committees, then ſitting in London, were alſo engaged in it. Theſe depoſitions are to be found in Borlaſe and Temple.

Even M'Mahon, a Popiſh prieſt, afterwards Biſhop of Raphoe, diſcovered to ſome members of the Privy Council, at whoſe feet he proſtrated himſelf for mercy, that he and others had been employed ſo early as the year 1634, to ſolicit the aſſiſtance of foreign princes, viz. the Pope, the Kings of France and Spain, and other ſovereigns, in order to engage the nation in a war; and it appears by Lord M'Guire's confeſſion, that this deſign was entertained ſo early as the year 1628, when a negotiation had been carried on with Cardinal Richelieu for that purpoſe.†

After ſuch unqueſtionable proofs, that the dreadful rebellion of 1671 had been ſo long concerted, Mr. Francis Plowden, whoſe mind is obviouſly clouded with bigotry, has the audacity to defend the conduct of the Iriſh Papiſts, in butchering many thouſand Proteſtants in cold blood, on the ſcore that they acted in their own defence; for in page 141 of his dull ponderous review of the Iriſh hiſtory, he falſely aſſerts, "that the moſt ſerious apprehenſions were entertained of an immediate and general maſſacre or extermination of the Catholics," and that "they united in a regular ſyſtem of ſelf-

---

* A certain number of perſons came to Dublin, from each county in the province of Leinſter, to aſſiſt in the inſurrection which took place there on the 23d of July, 1803.

† All theſe depoſitions are to be found in Temple and Borlaſe, and in Dr. Nalſon's impartial collections.

defence, which to this day," he ſays, "is moſt unwarrantably and unjuſtly ſtiled an odious and deteſtable rebellion."

The reader will not be be ſurprized at this, when he is informed, that in the dreadful and unnatural rebellion of 1798, he juſtifies the batcheries committed by the ſanguinary Iriſh fanatics, and criminates the loyal Proteſtants, who fought bravely, and bled profuſely, in defence of the conſtitution in church and ſtate.

On the trial of the conſpirators concerned in the gunpowder treaſon, Lord Coke, then attorney-general, obſerved, "that their ſcheme was no more than an appendix to the plots framed by their party in the reign of Queen Elizabeth;" and I think the ſame may be ſaid of the Iriſh rebels engaged in this conſpiracy; for treaſonable combinations ſubſiſted in Ireland from the beginning of her reign to this period. Subſequent to the general inſurrection, the Lords of the pale declared at the Council board, to the Lords Juſtices, "their loyal affections to his Majeſty, and their readineſs and forward concurrence in the ſervice;" and yet ſoon after they raiſed a large body of forces, and made Lord Gormanſtown General thereof, Hugh Byrne Lieutenant-general, and the Earl of Fingal General of the horſe. He was lineal anceſtor of the preſent Earl.

What opinion muſt we entertain, then, of Lord Fingal, in making ſuch aſſertions of the loyalty of his fellow-religioniſts, when ſuch facts, founded in the uniform and indelible records of hiſtory, ſtare him in the face, and when patroles of cavalry at this time begin to perambulate the city of Dublin, for its protection from Popiſh fury, ſo early as eight o'clock, and continue to do ſo all night!

They then framed an oath of allegiance, in which they promiſe to bear *faith and allegiance* to his Majeſty, his heirs and ſucceſſors, *as far as they may*, though they were in actual rebellion. This ſubterfuge meant, as far as the tenets of their religion would permit them to be faithful to an heretical Sovereign; and ſome ſuch evaſion was to be found in all the oaths of that Popiſh banditti, the Defenders. After this, they framed an oath of aſſociation, in which they renew their declaration *of true faith and allegiance to the King, his heirs, and lawful ſucceſſors;* but it contains theſe paragraphs, "I will obey and ratify all the orders and decrees made, and to be made, by the ſupreme council of the confederate Catholics of this kingdom, concerning the ſaid public cauſe (meaning the Roman Catholic religion). And I will not ſeek, directly or indirectly, any pardon or protection, for any act done, or to be done, touching this general cauſe, without the conſent of the major part of the ſaid council, and that I will not, directly or indirectly, do any act or acts that ſhall prejudice the ſaid cauſe, but will, to the hazard of my life and eſtate, aſſiſt, proſecute, and maintain the ſame."

"I will not accept of, or ſubmit unto, any peace, made, or to be made, with the ſaid confederate Catholics, without the conſent and approbation of the general aſſembly of the ſaid confederate Catholics. And for the preſervation and ſtrengthening of the aſſociation and *union* of the kingdom, that upon any peace or accommodation to be made or concluded with the ſaid confederate Catholics, as aforeſaid, I will to the utmoſt of my power inſiſt upon, and maintain the enſuing propoſitions, until a peace, as aforeſaid, be made, and the matters agreed upon, in the articles, be eſtabliſhed and ſecured by Parliament."

The tenor of theſe propoſitions was, "that the Popiſh primates, archbiſhops, biſhops, ordinaries, deans and chapters, archdeacons, prebendaries, and

and other dignitaries, parſons and vicars, and all other paſtors of the ſecular clergy, ſhould have and enjoy all, and all manner of juriſdictions, privileges, and immunities, in as full and ample a manner as they had or enjoyed the ſame, during the reign of the late Henry VII., and all the churches and church livings, in as large and ample a manner, as *the late Proteſtant clergy*, reſpectively enjoyed the ſame, on the firſt of October, 1641."

"That all laws and ſtatutes, made ſince the 20th year of Henry VIII., whereby any reſtraint, penalty, or reſtriction, is, or may be laid upon any of the Roman Catholic clergy or laity, or in the exerciſe of their religion, ſhall be repealed, revoked, and declared void, by one or more acts of parliament. A preamble was prefixed to this oath of aſſociation, in which the reaſon aſſigned for their uniting is, the neceſſity of defending their religion, their lives, liberty, and property, *and his Majeſty's regal power, juſt prerogatives, ſtate and rights*, plotted againſt by a puritan faction *."

Such was the *full ſhare in the benefits and bleſſings of our happy conſtitution*, which they fought for at that period by arms, and with the aſſiſtance of foreign powers; and which they now mean to aſſert by the ſame means.

They then aſſimilated themſelves to Parliament, having two houſes, with a ſpeaker or prolocutor; they proceeded, at Kilkenny, where they opened their ſeſſions, to regulate all the affairs, civil and military, of the kingdom, confronting, and at the ſame time inſulting, his Majeſty's government ſitting in Dublin.

They alſo formed a great ſeal, with which they authenticated their acts of ſovereignty, and their credentials, in all their negotiations with foreign princes, to whom they ſent, and from whom they received ambaſſadors, envoys, and agents. The prelates enjoined the prieſts to adminiſter the oath of aſſociation to their congregations, and to receive ſubſcriptions from them; which practice was ſecretly carried on during the progreſs of the conſpiracy which preceded the rebellion of 1798, and in Charles the Second's reign, as appears by Lord Orrery's letters. Notwithſtanding ſuch flagrant acts of rebellion, they profeſſed in the moſt unequivocal manner, *their faith and allegiance to the king*, in all their oaths, edicts, proclamations, and acts of ſtate †.

After this, and on the 17th of March 1642, they delivered to the king's commiſſioners at Trim, a remonſtrance, to be preſented to the king, conſiſting of thirteen articles, and containing a long liſt of ideal grievances, and juſtifying their having taken up arms; but its groſs untruths, and falſe and ſcandalous aſperſions on the government, were ably expoſed and refuted, paragraph by paragraph, by the Proteſtants, in a remonſtrance to his Majeſty.

---

* Whoſe aſſiſtance they ſolicited previous to the rebellion, as they did in 1798.

† Their conduct is well deſcribed in the following couplets of Hudibras, p. 1. c. 11. line 315.

"For as we make war for the king,
Againſt himſelf, the ſelf-ſame thing,
Some will not ſtick to ſwear we do,
For God, and for religion too."

The Iriſh Roman Catholics have boaſted of their attachment to James II.; but the following facts unequivocally prove, that they had no other deſign than to make him the inſtrument of promoting their ſelfiſh and intolerant deſigns; for they compelled him to give his aſſent to two acts of parliament; though they muſt have known, that they would have made him ſo odious in England, as to form an inſuperable bar to his reſtoration: one was, to attaint all the Proteſtant landholders in Irelend; the other, to make that kingdom independent of England. He heſitated to give his aſſent to the latter, conſcious that it would have ruined him in the eyes of the Engliſh people; but they ſent a meſſage to him by one Nagle, a rigid Papiſt, whom he had made attorney-general, that they could do without him; and he was obliged to yield.

(To be continued.)

New Illustration of a Passage in Virgil.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir,

I HAVE frequently made an obſervation, which I think will apply pretty generally, that the Commentators on the Claſſics, when attempting in an elaborate diſquiſition to elucidate any obſcure paſſage, very often render it more dark and ambiguous, and are apparently actuated more by the deſire of diſplaying the depth of their own erudition, and their penetration in reſearch, than by an anxiety to illuſtrate the difficulties of their authors.—In the following paſſage of Virgil I think all the Commentators have ſuffered the true interpretation to eſcape them, by forming unjuſt concluſions, and making falſe refinements on the expreſſions of the author.

Nam quâ Pellæi gens fortunata Canopi
Accolit effuſo ſtagnantem flumine Nilum
Et circum pictis vehitur ſua rura phaſelis;
Quâque pharetratæ vicinia Perſidis urget,
Et viridem Ægyptum nigrâ fœcundat arenâ,
Et diverſa ruens ſeptem diſcurrit in ora,
Utque coloratis amnis devexus ab Indis,
Omnis in hac certam regio jacit arte ſalutem.

La Cerda, the great Spaniſh commentator, himſelf, although endowed with acute diſcernment, and ſound judgment, has, in his ſtrictures on this paſſage, given birth to an hypotheſis, as utterly inconſiſtent with reaſon, as with the meaning of the poet. It is a well known maxim, that error, when ſanctioned by an author of celebrity, is of ſo inſidious a nature, as to taint with imperceptible inſinuation the opinions of others; thus the ſucceſſors of La Cerda, venerating his great pre-eminence in talent, and his keenneſs in critical acumen, have adopted and cheriſhed this miſtaken hypotheſis. I allude to this critic's conviction, that Virgil here means the Nile and Indus, two rivers very far remote from one another; and he founds his conviction merely on Virgil's mentioning the "*coloratis Indis.*" He does not here recollect, that the ancient philoſophers, and eſpecially the poets, ſtyled all thoſe regions "India" which lie between the tropics, under whatſoever meridian they may lie. In corroboration of this ſuggeſted emendation, he is obliged to doubt the authenticity of, and to expunge, the following line, "Et viridem," &c. He alſo maintains that "vicinia" is not the nom. caſe to urget,"

"urget," but the acc. plural, which is incompatible with the pure Latinity of Maro; and he supports this construction on no better authority than Seneca, who Cap. xv. de Brev. Vitæ has "VICINIO;" which reading is probably false, as Gronovius, in his edition, has it "versatur in *vicino* invidia;" and even granting that the model and standard of purity, the great Tully, has it "vicinium" in every page of his, yet we might still be in want of authority for its plural, and inconteſtible objections might be produced againſt it.

Zenophon, in his eighth book of his Cyropedia, relates that Cyrus, after his conqueſt of the Babyloniſh empire, bounded his vaſt extent of territory with Æthiopia; from whence this country, being part of and contiguous to the Perſian empire, might poetically, and even in cool reaſon, be called "Perſis."

The ancient topographers placed the ſources of the Nile among Montes Lunæ, in the 10½ degrees of S. L.

Perſis, or *Æthiopia*, ſays Virgil, "urget et fæcundat viridem Ægyptum nigrâ arenâ," which is really the caſe; on account of its proximity, the height of its mountains, and the periodical inundations of its river, which overflows and fertilizes the lands of Lower Egypt. All theſe countries, which Virgil here mentions, are adjacent to each other, extending along the banks of the Nile for many hundred miles, from its very ſource to where it diſembogues itſelf into the Mediterranean.—My arrangement of this paſſage is as follows:

"Nam omnis regio jacit certam ſalutem in hâc arte, quâ fortunata gens Pellæi Canopi accolit Nilum ſtagnantem effuſo flumine et vehitur circum ſua rura puctis phaſelis; quâque vicinâ pharetratæ Perſidis, urget et fæcundat viridem Ægytum nigrâ arenâ, et (quâ) amnis *devexus usquè* ab coloratis Indis, ruens diſcurrit in ſeptem diverſa ora."

Perhaps ſome may object to my interpolating *quâ*, in the laſt member of the ſentence between "*et*" and "*amnis*;" but, in anſwer to ſuch an objection, I affirm, that ſuch omiſſions in the poet are not only admiſſible, but very graceful and elegant; and, to corroborate my aſſertion, I will produce inconteſtible authority by the citation of another paſſage from the ſame bard; for Virgil himſelf, three lines after, G. iii. l. 349. "At non *quâ*," &c. omits a repetition of this word, although the ſenſe undoubtedly requires it after "*turbidus*;" another teſtimony of the true interpoſition of *quâ*, and that Nile riſes in a country diſtinct from Æthiopia, may be adduced from Salluſt. Bell. Jug. C. xix. "Dein loca exuſta ſolis ardoribus," &c.

And in further confirmation of this conſtruction of the paſſage, let me remark, with what propriety "*ruens*" is applied to the Nile, when hurrying with impetuoſity through Æthiopia, and frequently obſtructed in its channel by huge crags and impending ſteeps; nor do I think it conſiſtent with the refined judgment of Virgil to apply the epithet to the courſe of this river, when flowing in a broad and ſmooth expanſe through the ample plains of Lower Egypt; this latter interpretation has, however, been adopted by the critics.

And to add greater force to my obſervation, let me point out the beautiful analogy, the connection and ſymmetry, that ſubſiſt between the different parts of this deſcription, according to this conſtruction;—firſt, we ſee the Nile, where he expands his mighty waters in ſilent majeſty along the regions of Upper Egypt, and through ſeven mouths pours his accumulated ſtreams into the ocean;—next, we obſerve him paſſing through the ſpacious

vallies

vallies of Lower Egypt; these two territories, one at the northern extremity, and the other round the middle course of the Nile, are characterized by their conquerors;—whilst the countries around the sources of the river are distinguished by the "tawny Indians," through whose country it flows.

If you think these observations worthy to be presented to your readers, the honour of their insertion in your valuable Miscellany will be an ample remuneration for the trouble of your's, &c.

PHOSPHILOS.

Miss Williams's Correspondence of Louis XVI.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR,

IN the *Universal* Magazine for the last Month, in the review of Moleville's Refutation of Miss Williams's Calumnies upon the Correspondence of Louis XVI. is the following passage: "We cannot, however, close this Review without stating, with some degree of satisfaction, that in the Universal Magazine ALONE were these letters considered as FALSE on their first publication: ALL the other Reviews seemed more or less inclined to give credence to their authenticity." (Vide p. 63.) That the Monthly and Edinburgh Reviewers "seemed to give credence," and even more, I do not deny, but I am much mistaken, if, from the very first, they were not considered by the Anti-Jacobin Review as an imposture and mere fabrication. If it is so, and I am in an egregious error if such was not the opinion of the Anti-Jacobin Review, I see no reason why the Universal Magazine should thus arrogate solely to themselves the praise of superior penetration, in discovering and disbelieving the interpretations of this "pseudo-political" authoress. I think, however, we can hardly go so far, with propriety, as to call it penetration in any one to see through so barefaced and ill-contrived a forgery, but rather, perhaps, a consummate blindness in all the other Reviews, who were so careful and *sagacious* as even to have a doubt about the authenticity of such a correspondence. Should this letter be honoured with insertion, I need not say how gratifying it will be to me to have dispelled the most trifling cloud of accusation from a work which possesses so much real merit as the one which I have now the honour to address.

I am, Sir, with all respect,
Your most devoted admirer and constant reader,
PHILOS.

POETRY.

EPIGRAMS.

On Gallia.

Since from curs'd *Gallia* o'er the nations flow
Freedom of guilt—*equality* of woe;
Since thus she pours her bitterness o'er all,
Let *Gallia* henceforth be translated *Gall.*

The Corresponding Society.

Since traitors in these monstrous times
Of *corresponding* are so fond,
We'll hope that shortly with their crimes
Their punishments will *correspond.*

MODERN

MODERN DRAMAS COMPARED.

What a *strange* pack of nonsense is this "Speed the Plough,"
I think we may say without danger;
Yet a German's wild brain, we may fairly allow,
Has furnish'd the world with—*a stranger*.

VALUABLE ABSENCE.

A lovely youth there was, his parents' pride,
Who never gave them pain but when he died;
Thus our arch-patriot sees his country bleeding,
And never does it good—but by seceding.

ON BUONAPARTE.

Small mischiefs, *Buona-parté* cou'dst thou do,
Wert thou not back'd by *Mala-Party* too.

INCOGNITUS.

MISCELLANIES.

THE MIDDLESEX ELECTION.

FOR our periodical review of the political state of Europe, we must refer our readers to the preface to the present volume, which will appear with the Appendix, on the first day of October. In the mean time, the space which we formerly appropriated to that article cannot be better occupied than by some reflections on the late Election for the County of Middlesex, which, far from being unconnected with the politics of the country, forms a leading and distinguishing feature in them, opening to our view the principles and designs of a party, which has for some time lain dormant, and enabling us, in some degree, to appreciate the effects of that *broad-bottomed* administration, which so many persons of consequence, and so many more of no consequence, so lately combined to form; from the expected formation of which such immense advantages to the country were prognosticated; and from the failure to form which such fatal consequences to the public welfare were predicted.

On the former Middlesex Election we declared our sentiments pretty fully, and with that freedom which the subject required; and as the remarks which we then made are equally applicable to the circumstances of the *last* election, we refer our readers to Pp. 333, et seq. of our *twelfth* volume, and to Pp. 78, et seq. of our *thirteenth* volume, where they appeared. We then commented, with severity, certainly not undeserved, on those degenerate nobles who gave their support to the *Man of the Mob*; the man who had declared England to be a country destitute of liberty, and not fit for *him* to live in; who had publicly professed a congeniality of soul and sentiment with the self-convicted traitor, O'Connor; who had taken the naval *mutineers* under his special protection; and who, in short, had done all that zeal without knowledge, and activity without talent, could do, to excite a spirit of disaffection throughout the country. We entertained some hopes, that these *sprigs*, or rather these *excrescences* of aristocracy, would profit by the lesson which was given them; and that the good effects would be perceptible

tible in their conduct, on any future occaſion of a ſimilar nature. But, alas! a ſpirit of faction, it ſeems, not only ſtifles all the generous feelings of genuine patriotiſm, but ſubdues all ſenſe of ſhame!

We have had a repetition of the ſame profligacy in individuals; of the ſame diſgraceful ſcenes of violence and outrage; of the ſame fraud, falſehood, and perjury, as marked the Election of 1802. Sir *Francis Burdett*, it appears, had acquired additional claims to the ſupport of his old friends, and to the protection of his new ſupporters. Since that period, he had openly told the public, that *the country had nothing in it worth defending*; and that an indiſpenſible preliminary to preparations for defence, was *the repeal of every law which had been paſſed ſince the accession of his preſent Majeſty to the throne*; he had been the boſom friend of a convicted traitor to the very moment of his apprehenſion; he had, when at Paris, courted an intimacy with the libeller of his country, Thomas Paine; he had ſelected for his aſſociates at home, men the moſt notorious for their diſaffection; and he had been publicly ſtigmatized, at a County Meeting of Freeholders, as a man unworthy to appear, as their repreſentative, in the preſence of his Sovereign.

But the circumſtances of this Election, in whatever point of view they are conſidered, are, in their nature and tendency, of too much public conſequence to be paſſed over, with a ſlight notice, like any of the ordinary occurrences of the day. No *general* obſervations can do juſtice to them; they require, and deſerve, a particular and minute inveſtigation; and we ſhall therefore give a brief and ſuccinct Hiſtory of the Election; in the courſe of which we ſhall examine the various charges preferred againſt the different candidates; ſuffering them, occaſionally, to ſpeak for themſelves, but carefully diſcriminating between *aſſertions* and *proofs*; *fiction* and *fact*; *calumny* and *truth*; and interſperſing the narrative with ſecret anecdotes, for the authenticity of which we can vouch.

In the Election of 1802, Sir *Francis Burdett*, whom we ſhall characterize as the *Jacobin Candidate* *, for reaſons too obvious to need explanation, derived no inconſiderable advantage from the ſituation of his opponent, as Chairman of the Quarter Seſſions of the County; as this circumſtance afforded him an ample theme for declamation, and greatly facilitated the *laudable* attempt to inflame the minds of the populace, who have an natural averſion from law, and from Magiſtrates, who are bound to carry it into effect; but, above all, from goals, which impoſe very unpleaſant reſtrictions on the freedom of *active citizens*. Accordingly, he eagerly availed himſelf of this circumſtance; and, in his firſt addreſs to the public, talked of "*all the cruelties and tortures, and all the murders by torture, connected with it*, (the Houſe of Correction), and *reſulting neceſſarily from the ſyſtem by which it is re-*

* Sir Francis Burdett's favourite friend and truſty Counſellor, Mr. Clifford, declared on the Huſtings, during the laſt Election, that *he gloried in the name of* JACOBIN; a declaration for the ſincerity of which we incline to give him ample credit; he was not very fortunate, however, in the prediction which he uttered in the ſame breath, that *the cauſe of Jacobinism would be triumphant!* As he, therefore, who had the beſt opportunity for forming an accurate judgment on the ſubject, conſidered his client as the champion of that cauſe, and as a man of the ſame character with himſelf, our readers will readily acknowledge the propriety of the appellation by which we propoſe to diſtinguiſh him.

gulated."

gulated." Obſerving, *en paſſant*, that this horrible ſyſtem was the invention of a man whom the public have agreed to characterize as *the benevolent*, par excellence: it was ſuppoſed that this ſource of ſcurrility was exhauſted; or, at leaſt, that, not being oppoſed by the ſame candidate, the Baronet would loſe the benefit of it. But the ingenuity of Jacobiniſm exceeds the conceptions of the vulgar, and it was reſolved, in the *virtuous* cabinet of Piccadilly, that the name of his preſent opponent being the ſame, and he being, moreover, the ſon of his former competitor, and with all, *a Juſtice*, the ſame means ſhould be employed for raiſing a popular outcry againſt him. Accordingly, the following advertiſement appeared, by way of preparing the public mind for what was to follow:—

To the Independent Freeholders of the County of Middleſex.

Gentlemen,

THE great and diſintereſted encouragement which I have already experienced in my canvaſs, at once demands my grateful acknowledgment, and inſpires me with confidence of ſucceſs. To inſure this, however, your exertions muſt be unremitted, and the generous ſupport which you have hitherto given me ſhould be manifeſted by an early appearance in my favour. Among the ſucceſsful events of the late Scrutiny, I eſteem it the chief, that a great number of perſons were diſqualified, who, without any juſt claim to vote, had long been encroaching upon your rights. Theſe were the Prebendaries of Weſtminſter, with a long train of ſervants and penſioners, all the officers and placemen of the Courts of Chancery, King's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer. By one deciſion of the Committee, above 400 Voters of this deſcription were diſqualified. The removal of theſe men (the dependants of the Miniſter, and uniformly ſubſervient to his mandates) gives you a deciſive majority in the County. Let me requeſt you will but exert yourſelves, as becomes you, to maintain it, and you will defeat an intereſted oppoſition, which is raiſed only by Contractors, Placemen, and others, ſtill more unworthy to exerciſe the franchiſe of electors.

Of thoſe who are contented that the Miniſter ſhould ſquander public money without controul or inquiry, that Engliſh priſons ſhould be made dens of oppreſſion and torture, that the lives of their fellow-ſubjects ſhould be wickedly aimed at under colour of juſtice—of ſuch men I cannot be a fit repreſentative; let them carry their votes and their ſubſcriptions to my opponent. He may tread in the ſteps of his father, and will not bluſh to receive their ſupport. My better reliance is on the virtue and integrity of thoſe who behold with deteſtation the progreſs and conſequences of corruption, and who conſider each vote that is given (whether by the elector or the member) not as the inſtrument of private advantage, but as the diſcharge of a ſacred truſt.

I am, Gentlemen, your devoted humble ſervant,

Piccadilly, July 19, 1804. FRANCIS BURDETT.

Sir Francis probably chuckled at the idea of having as abſolute and excluſive a command of the *preſs*, as he had at the former Election; and of being treated with the ſame lenity, and forbearance which he then experienced. Happily, however, he was not ſuffered to remain long in this error. This precious effuſion of Jacobiniſm drew forth the following anſwer:—

To the Independent Freeholders of Middleſex.

SIR FRANCIS BURDETT has very ſoon indeed thrown off the flimſey veil

veil of WHIGGISM which ſome of his more artful ſupporters had perſuaded him to aſſume, and returned, like a dog to his vomit, to his favourite creed of PURE JACOBINISM. In his laſt addreſs to you he has reſumed his old tone, and, in the uſual cant of his ſect, has inveighed againſt *Churchmen* and *Statesmen, Officers, Eccleſiaſtical* and *Civil*. You will probably think with me, that he had better have ſpoken out at once, and, in the language of his worthy Fellow Labourer in the Revolutionary Vine-yard, THOMAS PAINE have declared "war againſt the *whole hell of monarchy*," for he very well knows that without ſuch officers as thoſe whom he ſtigmatizes, neither the Britiſh monarchy, nor any other government whatever, not even his favourite military deſpotiſm of France, could poſſibly ſubſiſt, nor the ordinary buſineſs of civil ſociety be carried on. He has told you that all the prebendaries of Weſtminſter, and all the officers of the Courts of Law and Equity (how came he to omit the Biſhops and the Judges, whoſe ſituations are ſimilar?) are "dependants of the Miniſter, and uniformly ſubſervient to his mandates." He knew the falſehood of this aſſertion when he made it, for the offices which he refers to are holden for life, and had ever been regarded as *Freeholds* until the late deciſion of a Committee of the Houſe of Commons. The perſons who hold them, therefore, are as *independent* as the poſſeſſors of any other freehold property. But it was natural enough for *him* to exult in the annihilation of rights enjoyed and exerciſed for ages, the direct and inevitable tendency of whoſe efforts is the ſubverſion of all exiſting inſtitutions, and the introduction of thoſe ſanguinary ſcenes of deſolation and anarchy which have rendered a neighbouring country an object of horror and of dread to all the nations of the earth. SIR FRANCIS BURDETT boaſts, too, of being the defender of your rights, and the champion of your independence. Yes; he has indeed, defended the rights and freedom of electors! but in a way peculiar to himſelf—by diſfranchiſing *real* freeholders for ſome trivial defect of form; by erecting into freeholders *men of straw* without the ſhadow of a right to vote, alike deſtitute of property and of principle, and by controuling your choice in the uſurpation of a ſeat to which your voice, legally expreſſed, but corruptly miſrepreſented, had raiſed another.—That after this conduct, and the complicated ſcene of tumult, corruption, and perjury exhibited at the laſt election, SIR FRANCIS BURDETT ſhould flatter himſelf, or inſult you by the ſtatement, that he could on the preſent occaſion *only* meet with oppoſition from "*contractors, placemen*, and *others* ſtill more unworthy to exerciſe the franchiſe of electors," (whom, however, he does not venture to deſignate) is an inſtance of ſelf-ſufficiency, and of confident effrontery which the county cannot fail duly to appreciate, and properly to reward.

By affirming that "Engliſh priſons are dens of oppreſſion and torture," and that the *lives of our fellow subjects are wickedly aimed at under colour* of *juſtice*, he at once libels his country and condemns himſelf. If he really believes this aſſertion (moſt *infamously falſe* as it is) to be true, why did he not make it the ſubject of a ſpecific motion in the Houſe of Commons during the two years which he was allowed to ſit there? Why not inſtitute a ſerious and ſolemn inquiry into the facts? Why not devote ſome ſmall portion of his wealth to the proſecution and puniſhment of ſuch atrocious offenders? Why not ſpecify the inſtances of oppreſſion and of torture? Why not explicitly declare *whose* lives have been wickedly attacked under the colour of juſtice? Why not propoſe ſome law to remedy the evils of which he complains? An honeſt man would not prefer ſuch charges as theſe without having

having the moſt ſatisfactory proofs of their juſtice, and an honeſt man in poſſeſſion of ſuch proofs would not ſatisfy himſelf with a bare ſtatement of the facts in a public advertiſement. Theſe are not electioneering ſquibs—theſe are not mere perſonal attacks, nor mere party effuſions. Such charges ſtrike at the root of ſociety itſelf. A libel on the *juſtice* of a country is an attack on its vital part; it tends to deſtroy every ſentiment of affection for the *Sovereign* who can tolerate ſuch abuſes, and of attachment to the conſtitution which can allow them to be committed with impunity. What muſt we think, then, of a man who can preſer ſuch charges without a ſhadow of proof to ſupport them? Is he, who can libel his country *for his own interest*, fit to be your repreſentative? The voice of every loyal freeholder will reprobate the preſumptuous thought!

If Sir Francis Burdett really held in deteſtation "*the progress* and *conſequences of corruption*," why did he encourage and ſupport the conduct of the Sheriffs at the laſt election, during its *progress*, which a committee of the Houſe of Commons have declared to be *corrupt*? And why did he profit by, and ſeek to perpetuate, the conſequence of it—his own ſeat in the Houſe? By doing this he has clearly proved the nature and extent of his objections to *corruption*: and poſſibly his hatred to priſons may be traced to its ſource, with equal facility, when it is recollected that his firſt abuſe of them was occaſioned by the confinement of *mutineers* in the *navy*, and by that of his friend Colonel *Deſpard*, whoſe praiſes he ſo loudly ſounded, whoſe cauſe he ſo forcibly pleaded in the Houſe of Commons, and whoſe friendſhip and intimacy he ſo ſedulouſly cheriſhed, and ſo carefully preſerved till the very hour of his apprehenſion on a charge of *high treaſon*, for which he was afterwards *executed*.

It is not ſurpriſing that a man who has ſelected for his *friends* and *aſſociates*, ſuch characters as *Deſpard*, ſhould call for a *repeal of all the laws* which have been paſſed during the mild and benevolent reign of *our preſent Sovereign*, the firſt of which laws, be it remembered, was that which *rendered the judges of the land independent of the Crown*. But it would be ſurpriſing, indeed, if ſuch a man were to meet with advocates and ſupporters among the freeholders of this Metropolitan County. Let thoſe who approve his principles ſupport the man. *You*, I am ſure, will avert ſuch diſgrace, remembering that this is a *public cauſe*, the cauſe of *law againſt licentiouſneſs*; *of order againſt anarchy*; that the eyes of the whole united kingdom are upon you, and that to every ſubject of the realm, you are reſponſible for your conduct, for, as it has been well obſerved, "on it may depend whether they will much longer be French or Engliſh ſubjects."

A MIDDLESEX FREEHOLDER.

If Sir *Francis Burdett* had felt any regard for his public character; if he had wiſhed to conciliate the eſteem, and to ſecure the patronage, of honeſt and upright men, theſe forcible comments on his moſt impudent addreſs would certainly have called forth a *reply*. It was ſurely neceſſary for a man, who claimed the public attention and ſupport, to ſubſtantiate the facts, his reprobation of which he choſe to conſider as conſtituting a great part of his claim, and to juſtify himſelf againſt the charge of falſehood here ſo directly preferred againſt him. But it ſeems to have been his object, from the firſt moment of his becoming a candidate, till the cloſe of the Election, to advance the moſt flagrant falſehoods as facts, and to preſerve a moſt contemptuous,

tuous, though a most convenient, ſilence, when dared to confirm them by proof: regardleſs of every thing, which an honeſt man values, in public life, ſo that he could but make an impreſſion for the moment favourable to the accompliſhment of his immediate object. In taking credit to himſelf for the diſqualification of Freeholders, who had for centuries exerciſed the elective franchiſe, he again tranſgreſſes the bounds of truth, as, indeed, he almoſt invariably does, whenever he addreſſes the public; for, inſtead of "*above* 400 voters of this deſcription" having been diſqualified, the number was *below* 200, as may be aſcertained by a reference to the minutes of the Committee of the Houſe of Commons. Even at an *advanced stage* of the Election, the *Jacobin Candidate* acknowledged from the Huſtings, that he could not abuſe his opponent, becauſe he *knew nothing of him*; yet even before the Election began, we ſee him abuſe this man, of whom he knew nothing, in the moſt infamous manner; and even aſſuming an intimate knowledge of his ſentiments and his principles, as manifeſted by the aſſertion, that Mr. Mainwaring, jun. would "not bluſh to receive the ſupport" of men "who are contented that the Miniſter ſhould ſquander the public money without controul or enquiry; that Engliſh priſons ſhould be made dens of oppreſſion and torture; that the lives of their fellow ſubjects ſhould be wickedly aimed at under the colour of juſtice." It muſt be conceded to us, that nothing but a moſt intimate knowledge of a man's diſpoſition could poſſibly juſtify another in bringing ſo heinous a charge againſt him. Yet of the man whom he ſo charged he afterwards acknowledged *he knew nothing!* The fact is, that this was neither more nor leſs than *a foul and wicked lie*; we happen to know the gentleman thus flagitiouſly calumniated; and we will tell Sir Francis Burdett, and dare him to contradict us, that he is a man of generous ſentiments, of ſound principles, and of exemplary conduct; who would not only bluſh to receive ſupport from ſuch characters as are here deſcribed, but would bluſh ſtill more to be ſupported by corruption, perjury, and fraud; and, moſt of all, to degrade himſelf by being the aſſociate of criminals, rebels, and traitors! We will unmaſk this profligate hypocrite, this wholeſale dealer in falſhood, (who has the effrontery to talk of relying on "virtue and integrity,") and expoſe him to the world in his genuine colours.

(To be continued.)

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Such communications of our Correſpondents as have not yet appeared are intended for inſertion in the Appendix.

TO OUR READERS.

The Appendix to Vol. XVIII. will be publiſhed on the firſt of October; and to it will be prefixed, by way of Preface to the Volume, a view of the Political State of Europe.

ERRATUM.

In the motto to the preſent Number, for "Milton" read "Langhorne."

APPENDIX

TO VOLUME XVIII.

Memoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſtoire de Notre Littérature depuis François Ier. juſqu'à nos jours. Par M. Paliſſot. 2 Tomes. A Paris, chez Gerard, Libraire, rue St. André des Arcs. No. 44. 1803.

Memoirs of French Literature, &c.

THE author of theſe memoirs is well known, by thoſe who are acquainted with French literature, as the writer of the dramatic piece entitled "*Les Philoſophes.*" The juſt and pointed ridicule there poured upon the men who, by their writings and indefatigable induſtry, have contributed to tear aſunder the bonds of ſociety, have endeavoured to deſtroy every moral feeling, and to deprive us of thoſe conſolations which religion alone can beſtow, led us to expect ſomething very different from what we meet with in this publication. But of France there is no hope, of liberty it has no idea, and ſeems equally contented under the reign of anarchy and of deſpotiſm. From the time of Louis XIV. to the diſſolution of the monarchy, the morals of the great became every day conſpicuouſly worſe: the middling ranks followed their examples, and a groſs ignorance, perhaps, happily for their ſituation, prevented the lower orders from ſeeing or feeling their abject ſtate. Like the degraded Romans they looked for nothing but "*panem et Circenſes*;" if they had brown bread, and could dance, though in wooden ſhoes, at the fête of their village ſaint, every wiſh of their heart was ſatisfied. In this ſtate of things appeared gradually a ſet of men, known at firſt by the name of *Gens de Lettres*, but who, as they roſe into conſequence and power, beſtowed upon themſelves, *excluſively*, the appellation of *Philoſophes*. Replete with the vanity, the theoriſing, and caſtle-building paſſion of Frenchmen, they combated by ſophiſtry, or held up to ridicule, every thing eſtabliſhed by the wiſdom of ages. Forms of government totally unſuited to human nature, and a morality highly ſuitable to a band of miſcreants, appeared in various ſhades and colours from this philoſophical manufacture; while the "*monſter*"* religion (ſuch was their term) was excluded by them from all their multifarious, diſcordant, and abſurd arrangements of ſociety. Europe, and the whole world feel, and will long feel, the dreadful effects of their too ſucceſsful ſchemes.

* "*Ecraſons le* MONSTRE!" was their *cri de guerre.*

Againſt theſe men Mr. Paliſſot boaſts to have written *Les Philoſophes.* True, he did write that comedy, and it is equally true that in it the philoſophiſts are ridiculed. But, from many things in the volumes before us, we are led to ſuſpect that his motives were not pure; that, inſtead of being impelled by the great intereſts of ſociety, the writer was influenced by reaſons leſs commendable, and that the work owed its birth to literary jealouſy, and to his not having been admitted into the philoſophiſtic conclave.

When a writer condemns in one perſon what he approves in another, we with reaſon conclude that *perſons* and not *ſentiments* are the objects of his ſatire and indignation. We can have little confidence in the ſincerity of Mr. Paliſſot when we find him execrating D'Alembert and others for their immoral and irreligious writings, while he appears as the apologiſt of Voltaire, the great apoſtle of immorality and infidelity. He does not ſpare the licentious writings of thoſe with whom he was perſonally at war; but this we muſt impute alone to his being at war with them, after having read what he ſays of the works of the younger Crébillon. "Let us not lay to his charge, (ſays he) the licentiouſneſs of the manners he has painted: he had a right to ſay to the age he lived in, Is it my fault if *theſe manners are yours?*" On the contrary, let us admire the ſingularity of that art by which he contrived to expreſs without groſſneſs the moſt looſe ideas, and to preſent the moſt voluptuous delineation—one is tempted to believe that the graces themſelves have caſt their veils over his nudities. We are not diſpoſed to contradict Mr. P. in what he ſays of French manners, we will only aſk him if he thinks that the object of Crébillon, and his prototype, Petronius, was a reformation of manners; or, ſuppoſing it to be ſo, whether their method of reform was likely to be ſucceſsful? And, laſtly, whether a perſon who at leaſt pretends to have a concern for public morals, ought, conſiſtently, to have ſpoken of Crébillon's works as he has done? But, above all, his paſſing over *Parny* without devoting him to execration determines our opinion of Paliſſot as to religion and morals. The groſs obcenity, and horrible blaſphemy, of Parny go beyond every thing which had appeared in the world: and yet he is characterized in the preſent work as "an amiable poet, full of grace, who has written many eaſy, natural, and voluptuous verſes, ſuch as were the production of the good old times." Ver. ii. p. 238. We juſt add, for the credit of Mr. Paliſſot's "*Gouvernement reparateur,*" and the Abbé de Lille's *Reſtorer* of *Religion*, that this execrable book is printed at Paris, *avec privilege!* we think by Didot.

From the work before us the author's attachment to the cauſe of liberty ſeems to reſt on grounds as unſubſtantial as his concern for religion and morals. The following paſſage, we cannot help thinking, will ſerve as a proper foundation for either the *Conſular* or *Imperial* regime of Buonaparté. "*Liberty* is undoubtedly the greateſt *good*, and *ſlavery* the worſt of *evils*: but we may be permitted to examine if that which is called liberty be not, *in the preſent ſtate of ſociety*, often

often a fatal advantage; and whether ſlavery, modified by the gentleneſs and indulgence of *a maſter*, and by the intereſt he has to preſerve his *ſlave*, would not offer a more happy ſituation than an illuſive liberty, the effect of which is almoſt always to ſend the wretched poſſeſſor in want and miſery to his grave." Tom. ii. p. 108.

After this we cannot be ſurpriſed when we find him giving to the preſent deſpotiſm of Buonaparté the appellation of "le gouvernement *reparateur*" to which France owes peace and glory. His anſwer to Helvetius is of the ſame complexion. "My country," Helvetius has ſaid, "has at laſt ſtooped to the yoke of deſpotiſm—the degraded nation is at preſent the ſcorn of Europe, no ſalutary criſis will ever reſtore its liberty." To this he triumphantly replies; "Theſe gloomy predictions have been moſt glorioufly belied by what has really taken place—the exiſtence of a *Firſt Conſul* did not enter into the calculations of philoſophy." Mr. Paliſſot either muſt have no feeling of the preſent ſtate of France, or, contrary to his feeling and conviction, he baſely joins in the groſs adulation now ſo generally beſtowed by that fallen nation on their Corſican tyrant. He can exclaim againſt the former tyrants of revolutionary France, when he mentions the death of Linguet. "He was condemned by that dreadful revolutionary tribunal, which, diſdaining even the appearance of legal forms, allowed no defence to the accuſed either by themſelves or by an advocate of their choice, and which, with barbarous ſport, founded its decrees of death on pretended ſuſpicions, of whoſe falſehood and abſurdity they were perfectly convinced." Yet this man, ſo clear-ſighted to the atrocities of former tyrants, is blind to all the enormities of "le gouvernement *reparateur*" of Buonaparté! Shall we apply to this perverſity of mental viſion—

"Thou art all *beauty*, or all *blindneſs* I?"

We are rather inclined to think that his confidence in the gentleneſs and indulgence of the "*maſter*" who at preſent rules over proſtrate France, is not of that kind which leads to the diſcloſure of real ſentiments. It is no very bold aſſertion to advance, that, if Mr. P. had riſked any "*reflexions hardies*" on the preſent adminiſtration of France, as Mézeray did under the reign of Louis XIV. he would not have eſcaped ſo well as that hiſtorian, who only loſt his penſion.

When we turn from the conſideration of the religious, moral, and political character of this publication, to a view of its literary merits, we do not find them of the firſt order. Many obſcure writers occupy more room than they ought to have done; while a ſhort, meagre, and unſatisfactory article is often all that is beſtowed on authors of the higheſt name. Perſonal antipathy, or its oppoſite, too frequently appears to guide the pen of Mr. Paliſſot: of courſe the reader, who gives him credit for impartiality, will be often deceived.—When he does mean to be impartial, we would not adviſe thoſe who wiſh to form a judgment on French literature to be implicitly guided by his deciſions. His taſte is too violently French to be followed as a ſure

guide. We know not whether he would carry his attention to *ſtile* ſo far as the *puriſte* Bouhours, who, when dying, muttered to himſelf, "I am going, or I am a going," and then, after a pauſe, "yes, both phraſes may be uſed,"* but we are not diſpoſed to chuſe for our leader in taſte, the man who aſſures us in one page, "that *ſtile* is *preciſely* what gives immortality to works of genius;" vol. i. p. 380, and in the next maintains, "it is *not by brilliancy of ſtile*, but by the *thoughts*, and *energy* of *expreſſion* that works reach without decay the lateſt poſterity." Ib. Pp. 381—2. We can have no confidence in a leader of this kind, who himſelf appears to have no certain rule on which to found his literary deciſions; and who, in fact, ſometimes decides by one of his criteria, and ſometimes by the other, as the caprice of the moment directs, or as beſt ſuits his purpoſe of praiſe or condemnation. Stile, however, upon the whole, ſeems to be his favourite criterion.

The following ſpecimens will enable our readers to form an idea of the writer's manner.

"Buffon (Louis le Clerc de), of the French Academy, and of the Academy of Sciences, born at Montbart, in Burgundy, in 1707, died at Paris in 1788. One of thoſe men whoſe reputation has augmented the glory of France after the age of Louis XIV. He is as ſuperior to Pliny as the ſound philoſophy of the preſent day is preferable to the errors of ancient phyſics. His Natural Hiſtory is a monument of genius and eloquence, for which we are envied by all Europe; and which has had in M. M. Guéneau de Monbeillard, and de Lacépède, continuators worthy to co-operate in that immortal work.

"The greateſt praiſe we can beſtow on Buffon is to acknowledge that he is every where equal to his ſubject. He is not only admirable in the ſmalleſt details, but when we read his firſt and ſecond views, we are tempted to believe that he has a portion of the *Supreme mind*, that in his delineation of the plan of nature he has *obtained by ſurpriſe* the ſecrets of the *Creator*.†

"His ſtile has appeared too poetical to ſome peeviſh and jealous minds, who have pretended that he has written the Romance rather than the Hiſtory of Nature. But who ought to paint, if not the hiſtorian of the wonders of the univerſe? And can the hand of a maſter be ſhewn, without ſometimes purloining the ſacred fire of poeſy?

"If Buffon appears to have paid ſome tribute to the weakneſs of humanity, it is by abandoning himſelf too much to the ſpirit of ſyſtem. After the example of Deſcartes, he has given us a coſmogony, not leſs ingenious, perhaps, but certainly not leſs chimerical than the world of that philoſopher. That ſpirit of ſyſtem is unhappily one of the vanities of phyſics. To it we owe the atoms, the vortices, the monades, and, laſtly, the organic living molecules. Were we permitted to ſay that the Supreme Being ſmiles, it would certainly be when he beholds man quitting his character of obſerver,

---

* "Je m'en vas, ou je m'en vais—oui, tous les deux ſe diſent."

† Mr. P. would have done well to recollect that, while he was writing what he, no doubt, thought a ſublime period, while he was converting M. Buffon into a Prometheus, he was himſelf a *blaſphemer*.

which

which alone ſuits his limited faculties, for the vain fancy of creating worlds." Vol. I. Pp. 122—4.

" Raynal (L'Abbē Guillaume Thomas), born at St. Géniez in 1711, died in 1796. His Hiſtories of the Parliament of England, and of the Statholderat, written in a ſtile ill-ſuited to the ſubject, loaded with miſplaced ornament, with anti-theſes, and an oſtentation of wit, were forgotten, when there appeared under his name a Philoſophical and Political Hiſtory of the Eſtabliſhments and Commerce of the Europeans in the two Indies, which he has never diſavowed. The importance of the object, and the attraction of novelty, neceſſarily made this hiſtory generally intereſting.

" Although errors, and even contradictions, are to be found in it, yet, as the author might have been deceived, and as leſs or more of negligence may be laid to the charge of every hiſtorian, for theſe the reputation of the work would not have ſuffered. But he was condemned for the audacious declamations which every where abound in it, and in which neither moral principles, the ſafeguard of ſtates, nor the ſtates themſelves, are reſpected. A fanatic himſelf, he ſeems intentionally to endeavour to inſpire his readers with that fanaticiſm which he is attacking: and his perpetual declamations fatigue the more, as they are evidently a clumſy veneering, which conſtantly break the thread of the hiſtory.

" It appears aſtoniſhing that a man, by his profeſſion devoted to religion, ſhould have been more paſſionately its foe than its moſt open enemies. *We** ſpeak not as theologians, but guided by that ſort of propriety adopted in the world. We will add that ſound criticiſm alone ſufficed to have prevented the author from falling into an affectation which has diſfigured his work, eſpecially in the latter editions; where theſe emphatic declamations appear in greater profuſion than in the firſt, and are accompanied by a kind of extatic and dythyramick hymns on the pleaſures of ſenſe, equally ſcandalous, miſplaced, and ſurpriſing. We wiſh to believe, and in effect do believe, that this crime of the author proceeded from weakneſs. He permitted a ſet of violent men, who ſeem to have aſſumed the right of granting or withholding reputation, to alter his hiſtory by the inſertion of theſe foreign additions. What confirms this perſuaſion is, that the work not only appears to come from different hands, but that pages are tranſcribed, without any acknowledgement, from other publications. We believe we may venture to ſay that, even in irreproachable portions of the work, the Abbé was aſſiſted by co-operators, and that among others, the very intereſting part on the Slave Trade was furniſhed by M. de Péchméja. It would not perhaps be very difficult to produce the proof of this.

" In his latter days, viewing the calamities which the revolutionary ſpirit had brought on his unhappy country, the Abbé Raynal ſeems to have repented his having diſſeminated thoſe dangerous opinions in his book, or permitted them to be diſſeminated. We ourſelves have heard him ſay, that we ſhould by no means receive literally the conceptions of philoſophy; that there were ſome which might leſs or more ſeduce the imagination, and which, nevertheleſs, it was impoſſible to realize. But, in that very book, where he has given the rein to every ſpecies of licentiouſneſs, the following

* The *nous* is always made uſe of by the author, which makes us think that the articles appeared firſt in ſome journal. All we know from the preface is, that this is a new edition, the author ſays much improved.

remarkable paſſage is to be found, which ought to have been a ſtrong antidote againſt the anarchical principles which were made to circulate with ſo much imprudence in the popular aſſemblies, and which have been the ſource of ſo many ravages. 'The phantom of equality is, of all others, the moſt dangerous in political ſociety. The preaching of this ſyſtem to the people, is not to recall their rights to their remembrance, no, it is to invite them to pillage and murder; it is to unchain domeſtic animals, and to change them into ferocious wild beaſts." Vol. II. p. 297—301.

The fantom of equality, thus well delineated by Raynal, *of late* ſpurned at by conſular Frenchmen, and which never could deceive any thinking mind, did not, however, become wholly unpopular in France till Buonaparté announced his regal and imperial will; and we have perceived that this degradation of the fantom has always kept pace with the expanſion of the Corſican's pretenſions. The roar of anarchy, it is true, has died away, not indeed ſilenced, as was to have been wiſhed, by legal power, but ſtifled under the iron hand of deſpotiſm, and is replaced by unmanly, crouching, and degrading ſilence, or by adulation ſtill more deſpicable, and more to be deplored.

We will indulge in one more remark on this extract from our author. It is that the objection he makes to the inconſiſtencies of Raynal may be brought againſt himſelf. He perpetually blows hot and cold. At one time he riſes with *high* (we wiſh we could ſay with *honeſt*) indignation againſt immoral writers; at another time, they are philoſophers who went a little aſtray, but did not wiſh their writings to be publiſhed; or amiable men, who wrote voluptuous works for their own amuſement. We would aſk him, does he think that theſe men had no wiſh to have their works read? Was it their deſire to concentrate all voluptuous ideas in themſelves? He will hardly ſay this. What good reaſon then can he give for their publication? We ſee not what he can ſay better than that a licentious man may, like the Chevalier Parny, not only write, but print *avec privilege*, or without it, whatever his contaminated mind conceives: and this indeed is the only concluſion we can draw from his *pro* and *con* publication. But, whatever may be the demerits of Mr. P. his criticiſm of Raynal is perfectly juſt. The voluminous work of the Abbé obtained for a time a reputation which it did not deſerve; and which, in this country, if our recollection do not deceive us, it owed in a great meaſure to the commendation beſtowed on it by that elegant hiſtorian, the late royal hiſtoriographer for Scotland.

Such is the character to which we think theſe volumes are intitled. It is not ſurpriſing that the ſentiments of the author concerning them ſhould be very different from ours. Yet, whatever were his *thoughts*, that he ſhould *write* of theſe memoirs as he does will convey to our readers a ſtriking example of the hardihood of French conceit, which cannot only *think* highly of itſelf, but boldly, and in the ſtrongeſt terms, tell us what it thinks. It may, therefore, be worth while to place before our readers part of what the author ſays on this ſubject in his preface.

preface. The extract will likewiſe ſerve another good purpoſe: it will ſhew that Paliſſot has lived a life of literary warfare, a warfare which in France is carried on with a rage and obſtinacy of which in this country we have no conception. Such indeed is the violence of the war, that the arm of deſpotic power is called in by each party, as often as either can obtain that dangerous and abſurd interference. When an active partizan in ſuch diſputes comes to ſpeak of contemporary writers, we can place little confidence in his pretenſions to impartiality: "*ſervabit odorem teſta diu:*" and, in fact, our author's ſympathies and antipathies are ſufficiently apparent in the work, though he boaſts of "auſtere candour."

"I confeſs that, in giving to theſe memoirs the *austere candour* which is indiſpenſible *in a work which must become classical*, and which has been often cited as authority, I often doubted whether it were expedient that this edition ſhould appear during my life. It is known to many of my friends that, at firſt, determined on its not appearing till after my deceaſe, I had compoſed the preface with that view. Having reached that time of life to which quiet ought to be of all things the moſt deſireable, I wiſhed my latter days to remain undiſturbed by the ſtorms of irritated ſelf-love—but I have been determined by other conſiderations. The time, it is true, is paſt when the fire of youth, and the zeal of ſound principles, led me to defy thoſe ſtorms, but I have acquired that philoſophical compoſure which teaches me to deſpiſe injuries, and I am firmly determined from henceforward to combat them only by the ſilence of contempt. I abandon myſelf to my fate, like the old lion of the fable, let my enemies approach, they ſhall not diſturb my repoſe." Pref. Pp. 3, 4.

This old lion, ſince lion he muſt be, we ſuſpect does not poſſeſs all the philoſophical indifference he pretends to.

The author's account of writers previous to, and during the reign of Louis XIV. though far from ſatisfactory in many points, may, in general, be depended on, as far as it goes. His reprobation of the preſent ſtile of writing in France, and the neologiſm of the living authors, is likewiſe commendable.

Origines Gauloiſes, celles des plus anciens Peuples de L'Europe. Puiſées dans leur vraie ſource, ou recherches ſur la langue, L'Origine et les Antiquités des Celto Bretons de l'Armorique, pour ſervir le l'Hiſtoire ancienne et moderne de ce Peuple, et a celle des Francáis. Par le Tour-D'Auvergne-Corret, premier Grenadier de la Republique Francaiſe. A Hambourg, chez P. F. Fauche, Imprimeur-Libraire, et à Paris, chez tous les Libraires. 8vo.

Origin of the Gauls and of the moſt ancient Nations, &c.

THE early part of the hiſtory of nations, from want of records which may be relied upon with any degree of certainty, is generally involved in impenetrable obſcurity. But where authentic documents fail, every nation is poſſeſſed of ſome fabulous and often extravagant

extravagant ſtories concerning its origin. Upon theſe imagination is left to riot, and "ſtrange works produced oft." Every perſon applies them as his information and peculiar turn of mind may direct, and conſequently with every new hiſtorian a new theory ariſes, and the ſubject is involved in deeper obſcurity than before. Such has been the caſe with the generality of nations, but more particularly with the Celtæ. Thoſe who have thought proper to enquire into the origin of this people, have, for the moſt part, been actuated by a ſpirit of partiality and a love of theory, and by their acrimonious conteſts among themſelves have thrown accumulated rubbiſh upon the ſpot which they wiſhed to clear, and prejudiced the world againſt that cauſe which they wiſhed to maintain. Theſe diſputes, however, have been ſo far advantageous that they excited a ſpirit of enquiry, both in this country and on the continent, into the origin of the race by which the weſt of Europe appears to have been firſt peopled. Theſe enquiries are now proſecuted, if not without prejudice, at leaſt, without rancour; and the attention which has begun to be paid to the Celtic language in Great Britain, and on the continent, promiſes to point out, if not a clear and certain, at leaſt, a fair and probable mode of bringing the diſpute to an end. The attention that has been paid to an extended knowledge of languages, has pointed out the advantages that may be derived from etymology, when combined with other probable circumſtances, in tracing the antiquities of nations, and in clearing the myſteries of fable. Of theſe advantages the author of the preſent work has availed himſelf. In the idioms of the Bretons and the Gauls of Great Britain, he has traced the ancient Celtic, in the condition in which that language was ſpoken before the invaſion of the Romans and Franks. The plan of the work, therefore, is *to demonſtrate* the phyſical and moral connection of the Bretons of Armorica with the ancient Gauls, to eſtabliſh the identity of the language of the two nations from the ſimilarity that ſtill exiſts between the language of Breton, and thoſe which are uſed in the different countries of Europe and of Aſia into which the Gauls carried their victorious arms, and where they formed eſtabliſhments; to extract from the records of ancient hiſtory all the paſſages cited as Gallic, and to explain them by the language of the Bretons; to look for the ſolution of many intereſting queſtions in hiſtory and Pagan mythology in the etymology of the Gallic tongue; to revive the Celtic language, and to re-eſtabliſh in their deſerved ranks among the nations the Gauls, that celebrated people, of whom the genuine remains are ſtill to be found among the Bretons of Armorica, and in the Gallo-Franks (the French) their original deſcendants.*

* Our author ſhews a little national vanity here. The genuine deſcendants of the Celts are to be found in the Bretons of France, and in the Welſh, the highlanders of Scotland, and the Iriſh. The Germans, the Spaniards, and many of the Italian ſtates might claim as cloſe an alliance with them as the French.

In

In purſuance of this plan, the author commences his work with ſome general remarks on the origin of the Gauls, the Druids their prieſts, and the Bards their poets. Theſe remarks are ſcarcely worth mentioning, as they are very ſuperficial, and lead to nothing concluſive. Some intereſting paſſages of ancient hiſtory are, however, explained and applied, and ſeveral ancient Celtic monuments and inſcriptions found in Armorica deſcribed. He then proceeds to conſider the cuſtoms, manners, dreſs, and inſtitutions of the ancient Gauls and Celto-Scythians as recorded by antient hiſtorians, and to inſtitute a compariſon between theſe nations in thoſe reſpects, and the Bretons of Armorica. The Bretons, the author obſerves, have preſerved the cuſtom of their anceſtors in wearing their hair long and waving on their ſhoulders. That this was an uſage among the Gauls we learn from Cæſar, who calls the country *Gallia Commata*. He then examines the dreſs of the Bretons, and produces various paſſages from ancient writers to prove that it correſponds with the dreſs of the ancient Gauls. The ancient Gauls, as well as the modern Bretons, have been always remarkable for a ſtrong conſtitution of body, particularly for the ſize and *thickneſs* of their ſculls, which, perhaps, was a wiſe proviſion of nature, who furniſhed this defence againſt the hard blows which theſe ſkulls were deſtined to receive in battle.

The ſimilarity is further purſued in treating of the manners and cuſtoms of the ancient Gauls and modern Bretons. The cuſtom of painting the body with emblematical figures is ſtill partially retained by the inhabitants of Armorica. They are ſtill, like the ancient Gauls, credulous, ſuperſtitious, inconſtant, hoſpitable, and extremely proud of their proweſs in the field. The author next deduces from ancient hiſtory proofs of the relation that exiſts between the ancient Gauliſh and modern Celtic language. Here he has certainly proved his poſition; but it is one that ſcarcely required to be treated at ſo great a length. That the ancient Celtic language has been preſerved by the highlanders of Scotland, the Welſh, the Iriſh, the Bretons, and others, with more or leſs variation, is ſcarcely now diſputed by any one. Moſt of the inſtances which he produces are indeed too obvious to admit of a doubt. But it is obſervable, that the author himſelf was but little acquainted with the language concerning which he writes, if one may judge from ſome palpable miſtakes which he has committed.

Thus, Auſonius celebrating a fountain in the environs of Bourdeaux, held ſacred by the Celts on account of its ſalubrious properties, obſerves, that it was called by them DIVONA; *Divona, Celtarum lingua, fons addite Divis.* Here the author has made an awkward attempt to find the meaning of the word *Divona*, by ſuppoſing it a compound of two Celtic terms, ſignifying *two fountains*; and gravely conjectures that the fountain in queſtion was formed by the union of two ſprings. But what in this caſe becomes of the *fons addite Divis* of Auſonius, which plainly refers to *Divona*, the name of the fountain? Nothing, in fact, can be more obvious than that the word

Divona

Divona is compounded of the two Celtic terms *Di*, God, and *aon*, a fountain, which makes the word ſignify the fountain of God, or the ſacred fountain, and this exactly correſponds with the *fons additæ Divis* of Auſonius. In this chapter, the author alſo traces the connection between the languages of ſeveral of the Aſiatic nations and that of the Celts, and concludes from thence that the Gauls had carried their victorious arms into theſe quarters. One inſtance is the following. The *Cimmerian Scythians* eſtabliſhed upon the borders of the *Palus Mæotis* (the dead ſea), called that lake *Mor Maruſa*.* By the Bretons, and all the unmixed deſcendants of the Celts, it is called *Mor Maru*, in Engliſh, the Dead Sea. The author here, as in other places, ſeems to have taken a narrow view of the ſubject. The misfortune is, that every etymologiſt, after tracing words through various languages, in a manner that has juſtly rendered this mode of reaſoning liable to ſuſpicion, immediately draws his own concluſions, without ever reflecting that inferences equally, if not more legitimate, of a different nature may be drawn from the ſame premiſes. Etymology is an excellent auxiliary, but a very unſafe leader. It is, however, certain, as the author obſerves, that the Celtic language may be traced along the banks of the Tanais, the Tigris, the Euphrates, the Danube, the Rhine, and, he might have added, the Indus and the Ganges; but it does not therefore follow that the Gauls or Celts, properly ſo called, overran the world with their victorious arms. Perhaps the only way in which this ſimilarity of language can be rationally accounted for, is by ſuppoſing that all nations have preſerved ſome remnants of the language ſpoken at the time of the diviſion of the earth among the *Nohabidæ*. Every ſtep that has been made towards a general knowledge of the languages of the earth has been attended for the moſt part with a theory, and theory has been added to theory, each exceeding the preceding one in extravagance and improbability. The reſult however of a complete inveſtigation of languages will probably be, that the ſuppoſition we have mentioned will be generally received. It contains nothing extravagant, it explains circumſtances otherwiſe unaccountable; it derives probability from many parts of the mythology of the ancient heathens, and the fables of the ancient poets. Upon any of theſe ſeparately, little dependance can be placed, but when coupled with ſimilarity of language, and a variety of circumſtances reflecting light upon one another, they form a ſtrong body of probable evidence. This probability is further ſtrengthened by many paſſages in the hiſtory of Moſes. As for thoſe who reject all the evidence of ſacred and profane hiſtory upon the ſubject of the origin of the human race and of language, it would be a vain attempt to reaſon with them. Their own inventive brains have diſcovered that mankind have ſprung from

---

* *Mor Maruſa*, vox vere Cimbrica, nam SCITHÆ quibus Cimbrica lingua fuit vernacula, hanc vocem habuerunt. Plin. et Macrob.

fiſhes

fiſhes and monkeys, and who ſhall ſet hiſtory or probability againſt the fruits of their ſagacious heads? Peace be with them! Who envies a madman when he fancies himſelf an emperor?

The author concludes this chapter with an account of the expeditions of the Gauls, which are recorded in ancient hiſtory, extols their valour in the bombaſtic ſtyle of his country, and obſerves that their glory has only been equalled by that of the French, their deſcendants.*

The author next proceeds to point out a variety of nations in Europe and Aſia whoſe languages reſemble that of the Celts. From ſeveral paſſages in the Greek hiſtorians he concludes, that thoſe words in the Greek which are the ſame with the Celtic, were derived from the Celto-Scythians. He then traces the connection of the Celtic with the Hebrew, and gives a vaſt number of examples. The Hindoo and Perſian languages are omitted, but theſe, of courſe, follow the Hebrew, at leaſt as far as to anſwer the author's object. Upon the languages of Europe, eſpecially upon thoſe of the Scotch highlanders and the Welſh, he dwells with more minuteneſs than is neceſſary, and perſiſts in proving what every one who has alluded to the ſubject is already acquainted with. The next object of the author is to examine the names of the deities worſhipped by the heathens, and the qualities belonging to them. Theſe he labours to prove are original Celtic words, but in a very unſatisfactory manner for the moſt part. The only guide he follows is etymology, which is ſo apt to lead aſtray, and even his derivations are often forced and far fetched. He then endeavours to prove that the Greeks had derived many of their names for the planets, their cuſtoms and games, from the Celts; but as he only relies upon the ſame guide, his concluſions muſt be adopted with caution. The remaining part of the book, which forms a conſiderable portion of it, is employed in tracing the Celtic terms and names in various languages, for the elements, the different nations of Europe and Aſia, their capes, promontories, mountains, cities, and ſo forth. In this part of his work the author is more ſucceſsful than uſual, and ſome of his obſervations are extremely ſtriking. But he is ſtill very apt to give the reins too much to his imagination, and this often deſtroys the weight of his more forcible remarks. At the end of the work he has given a table of the order of deſcent in the different languages of Europe, which is as follows. From the Celto-Scythic, or Celtic, which he conſiders as the parent language, comes 1ſt the Cimbric or Runic, from which latter are formed the Daniſh, Gothic, or old Daniſh, the Scandinavian, Gothic, or old Swediſh, the Norwegian, and the Icelandic: from the ſame parent language (the Celtic) comes, 2dly, the Teutonic, or old German, from which are

* Another inſtance of national vanity. Whatever might be the glory of the Gauls in theſe expeditions, it can reflect little on the preſent inhabitants of France, the Bretons excepted.

formed

formed the Mæſo-Gothic, the Anglo-Saxon, the Belgic or Dutch, the modern dialect of Switzerland, the vulgar Saxon and the Frizelandiſh. The Celtic has alſo, 3dly, produced the languages of Bohemia, Poland, and of the greater part of the Ruſſian empire, as well as the old Greek and Latin, with all the modern tongues that are formed from this laſt ſource. The author concludes the whole with a gloſſary of words from the Celto-Breton, each of which words he traces through a variety of languages.

This book is certainly not altogether deſtitute of intereſting information, and ingenious remarks. When we conſider the ſituation in which the author proſecuted his enquiry; when we reflect that the work was compoſed, or, at leaſt, the materials prepared amidſt the din of battle, and during the progreſs of a predatory and licentious army, it is impoſſible not to allow the author ſome praiſe for diligence and a love of learning. But theſe are the utmoſt boundaries to which we can advance. Throughout the whole of his book he has reaſoned only from etymology, than which nothing can be more uncertain. Indeed the ſphere in which he moved, and the few opportunities which he poſſeſſed of acquiring comprehenſive views of his ſubject, rendered it impoſſible for him to produce any thing great and ſatisfactory. But his work contains ſome valuable information, and may be conſulted with advantage by thoſe who may wiſh to treat the ſame ſubject in a more full and ſatisfactory manner.

Annales de L'Imprimerie des Aldes; ou Hiſtoire de trois Manuce, et de leurs Editions. Par Ant. Aug. Renouard. 2 Tomes. 8vo. Pp. 846. Paris. 1803.

THOSE who reſtored the knowledge of the claſſic authors of Greek and Roman literature, in Europe, and excited a chaſtened taſte for their excellencies, about three hundred years ſince, are, for many reaſons, juſtly numbered among the trueſt and moſt eſtimable benefactors of mankind.

Perhaps none of theſe are more deſerving of our grateful veneration than the three MANUCCI of Venice, *Aldo* the elder, *Paulo* his ſon, and *Aldo* his grandſon. They were printers in an age when almoſt every printer was, neceſſarily, a man of extenſive and accurate learning. They were commentators and critics, at that period when the labours of illuſtrative and emendatory criticiſm, were in the languages and literature which they chiefly ſtudied, the moſt eſſentially uſeful, and the moſt difficult. They were famous, even while living, as among the moſt eloquent writers of their time. Aldo, the elder, was the publiſher of the firſt printed editions of many of our beſt Greek authors. Paulo, his ſon, was the beſt modern imitator of Cicero's ſtyle, and the beſt commentator on his writings. Aldo, the grandſon, was the moſt popular profeſſor of Latin eloquence that had ever been known in Italy.

M.

M. *Renouard*, therefore, deserves the thanks of all who take an interest in the advancement of learning, and of the arts with which it is the most intimately connected, for the industry which he has employed, in these Annals, to illustrate the lives of the Aldi, and the history of their press. De Thou, and others of their eminent contemporaries, were the first to pronounce due eulogies on their extraordinary merits. In Germany, *Unger* published, in 1729, a learned work on the history of these three printers. It was reprinted by *Geret*, at Wittemberg, in 1753, with notes correcting mistakes, and supplying omissions. Aldo, the elder, is, more expressly, the subject of Unger's work. *Manni* published at Venice, a work more regularly historical, on the life and publications of the elder Aldo. In 1754 and 1758, Father *Lazzeri* printed at Rome a very minute and elaborate collection of all the remains and memorials which he could find in print or manuscript, to illustrate the history of Paulo Manucci. Nothing escaped this learned Jesuit's research that had the smallest relation to the history of his hero. But, his book is more remarkable for labour and fidelity, than for jndgment or taste. In the year 1736, Apostolo prefixed to a translation of Cicero's "Epistles to his Friends," printed at Venice, an account of the Manucci, which is at once the most elegant and the most satisfactory work that has been published in Italy respecting this illustrious family. It is not, however, accompanied with any catalogue of the different works printed at the Aldine press. Cardinal de Brienne, with the assistance of his librarian, M. Laire, printed at Pisa, in the year 1790, a catalogue of the books printed by the Aldi: and that catalogue was reprinted, with emendations and additions, at Sienna, in 1791. M. Renouard having acquired, by purchase, in 1794, all the publications from the Aldine press, which were in the library of Cardinal de Brienne, together with what materials the Cardinal possessed in manuscript, for the improvement of his catalogue; and purchasing, afterwards, at a sale, a large collection of notices relative to the Aldi, which had been put in writing, by the learned Abbot Mercier de St. Leger, was encouraged by these acquisitions to enter upon a task which he had long fondly meditated, and thus produced the present work.

Of the two volumes which it fills, one contains an accurately descriptive catalogue of all the books printed by the Aldi; the other is appropriated chiefly to the display of the events of their lives,

An elaborate, yet ingenuous, preface is the first article in the second volume. It relates the author's motives to this undertaking, indicates the sources from which his materials have been drawn, and states what he had to surmount, in bringing his work to that degree of perfection in which he has presented it to us.

The author then enters upon the biographical part of his work, from the æra of the birth of ALDO, the elder. He was born in the year 1447. Bassiano, a small town in the duchy of Sermonetta, was his birth place. He received his education, successively, at Bassiano, Rome, and Ferrara. He became a favourite friend of the famous

Prince

Prince Giovanni Pico, of Mirandola, and tutor to his nephew, Alberto Pico, prince of Carpi. With the aſſiſtance of theſe two noblemen, he was enabled, in 1488, to form an eſtabliſhment for printing in the city of Venice. He deſigned his own types, partly after the model of thoſe which had been uſed as early as 1472, by Vindelin of Spira, partly in imitation of the hand-writing of the illuſtrious Petrarch. They were engraven and caſt, under his direction, by Franciſco of Bologna. Aldo procured manuſcripts to employ his preſs from all parts of Europe; cultivated the friendſhip of the moſt learned men of the age; formed a ſort of academy in his own houſe; and purſued the exerciſe of his art with zeal much more for the reſtoration and advancement of learning than to acquire a fortune by it. In the year 1500, he took to wife the daughter of Andrea d'Aſola, a printer, who had followed their common profeſſion with a more ſordid ſpirit, but with greater pecuniary ſucceſs than Aldo. He met, afterwards, with various loſſes and diſappointments, which, however, he ſurmounted, and by degrees retrieved. He and d'Aſola carried on their buſineſs, for ſome years, in partnerſhip, towards the end of Aldo's life. At nearly ſeventy years of age, this learned, laborious, ingenious, and noble-minded man, died; leaving, by his wife, who was much younger than himſelf, three ſons and one daughter. His death was in the year 1515.

The children of Aldo were educated, for ſome time, with their mother, in the country; and the buſineſs of the printing-houſe was, in the meanwhile, continued by their grandfather, and his two ſons, their uncles. PAULO MANUCCI, the ſecond ſon of Aldo, beginning, very early, to give proofs of a genius like his father's, and to evince a predilection for the ſame profeſſion, was, upon this, removed from the country to Venice, and inſtructed, with peculiar care, under the direction of his father's learned friends. He ſtudied with indefatigable zeal and perſeverance. In the year 1533, he aſſumed the management of the printing-houſe, for the benefit of himſelf and the other heirs of his father and grandfather. The Latin claſſics, and above all theſe, Cicero, were the favourite ſubjects of his ſtudies: and he employed his preſs chiefly, for ſome time, in giving new editions of the moſt eminent among them. He aſpired to write a Latin ſtyle of exquiſite purity and elegance; and, taking Cicero for his model, ſhunned the uſe of almoſt every form of expreſſion of which there were not examples in that great orator's writings; and, by unwearied pains, actually ſucceeded in compoſing letters which appear as if they had been written by Cicero himſelf with the moſt careleſs eaſe. In 1535, Paulo was invited to Rome, with promiſes of high patronage and promotion. He went, was well received, and had the honour to make his converſation acceptable to Marcello Cervino, afterwards Pope Marcellus the Second; to Bernardo Maffei; to Annibale Caro; and to various other perſons of diſtinction and great perſonal merit. But, after ſome months of diſſipation and attendance among the great, without any immediate utility to his fortune, he became ſick of ſuch

an

an idle and profitleſs way of life, and returned, in great impatience, to his ſtudies and toils at Venice. For three years, he joined to his other engagements, that of ſuperintending the claſſical ſtudies of a party of twelve young Venetian noblemen. In 1558, he went on an excurſion to ſearch for certain unprinted manuſcripts in a valuable library at Ceſena, and in ſome ſimilar collections in other parts of Italy. He, about the ſame time, declined invitations to the profeſſorſhips of Latin eloquence, firſt at Venice, afterwards at Padua. After a ſecond excurſion to Rome, he married, in the year 1546, Margherita Odoni. He had, by this lady, four children, of whom a ſon and a daughter are known to have ſurvived him. In the year 1546, he became profeſſor of eloquence and printer in an academy which Fedirigo Badoaro, a rich ſenator of Venice, attempted to eſtabliſh, on a noble and extenſive ſcale, in that city. After the diſſolution of Badoaro's academy, Paulo Manucci, at the invitation of Pope Pius the Fourth, went, in 1561, to Rome, and, without relinquiſhing his buſineſs in his native place, was there eſtabliſhed as printer to his Holineſs, *in ædibus Populi Romani.* He continued in this employment nine years, and printed with great beauty and accuracy a number of valuable eccleſiaſtical works. Loſs of health, and diſappointments in fortune, inducing him at the end of that time, to leave Rome; he paſſed nearly the next two years of his life, from September 1570 till the ſummer of 1572, in excurſions to Piove del Sacco, Genoa, Reggio, Milan, Venice, and in temporary reſidences in each of theſe cities. At Rome he was graciouſly received by Gregory the Thirteenth, then Pope, who aſſigned to him a liberal and honourable ſtipend, without any condition of labour on Manucci's part. In 1573, his daughter was, with his approbation, married to a young lawyer. On the 6th of April, 1574, he died, at the age of ſixty-one years, nine months, and twenty-ſix days. He appears to have been, in all the relations of life, a very worthy man. His letters, his illuſtrations of Cicero, and his treatiſes on ſubjects in Roman antiquities, diſtinguiſh him as one of the beſt writers, and one of the moſt elegant and accurate ſcholars of the age in which he lived. As a printer he did not, indeed, put in the preſs, for the firſt time, ſo many manuſcripts of the Grecian claſſics as his father, but he was in no other reſpect inferior to him.

His ſon, the younger ALDO, was born at Venice, in 1547; educated with the greateſt attention and ſolicitude by his father; early praiſed by Muretus and others of Paulo's friends, as the moſt promiſing boy they had ever known; introduced to the public at the age of eleven years, as the author of a ſkilful and copious collection of the comparative elegancies of phraſeology in the Italian and the Latin languages. At the age of fourteen he publiſhed an elaborate treatiſe on the orthography of the Latin tongue. From 1561 to 1563, he explored, under his father's direction, the Muſea and libraries in Rome. A treatiſe of his, "On the Marks of Abbreviation in Uſe among the Ancients," was printed, together with a ſecond edition of his work upon

upon Orthography, at his father's preſs in Rome, in the year 1566. He gave, alſo, at Rome, in this early part of his life, an edition of the two hiſtorical pieces of Salluſt, with the fragments of that author's other writings, and with notes. To his ſteady diligence and premature ingenuity and learning, his father was, then, induced to confide the direction of the preſs at Venice, while he himſelf continued at Rome. In 1571, he publiſhed an edition of the hiſtory of Velleius Paterculus, in which it is alledged that he made a great and ſomewhat pilfering and diſingenuous uſe of certain notes and various readings, communicated to him by the learned Dupuis (Puteanus) of Paris. He publiſhed, in 1572, "a Treatiſe in Praiſe of the Conſtitution of the Venetian Republic." That ſame year he eſpouſed Franceſca Lucrezia, a lady of the family of the Giunti, the famous printers of Florence. In 1574, he became ſole manager of the Aldine printing-houſe at Venice. In 1575, he brought out a treatiſe in Italian, "on the Phraſeology of Cicero's Epiſtles," as, alſo, an "Abſtract of his own Treatiſe on Latin Orthography," and a ſmall "Diſſertation on Letter-Writing," which he addreſſed to Muretus. In 1576, he publiſhed a curious eſſay, *De Quæſitis per Epiſtolam*, in which he endeavoured to explain thirty of the moſt remarkable difficulties in Roman Antiquities. He was, about this time, nominated Profeſſor of Polite Literature, and Lecturer in the Venetian Chancery, to inſtruct ſuch young perſons as wiſhed to qualify themſelves for the functions of ſecretaries to the republic. He made, in 1578, with very little previous ſtudy, a very eloquent funeral oration on Bernardo Rottario, Ambaſſador from the Duke of Savoy to the Venetian republic. He gave, in 1581, an edition of Cenſorinus. In 1582, he paid a viſit to Cardinal Borromeo, at Milan. He publiſhed, in 1583, an edition of the works of Cicero, in ten volumes folio. In 1584, he wrote and publiſhed a ſmall treatiſe in Italian, which he entituled, "*The Perfect Gentleman*." In 1585, he accepted an invitation to the Profeſſorſhip of Eloquence at Bologna, then vacant by the death of the famous Carolo Sigonia. The laſt work he publiſhed at Venice, was "a Collection of Phraſes from the Works of Terence;" and his firſt publication at Bologna, was a Commentary on Horace's Epode *De Laudibus Vitæ Ruſticæ*. He publiſhed, at the ſame place, in 1586, a valuable "*Hiſtory of the Life of Coſmo de Medici*." Soon after, he was invited by the Great Duke Ferdinand, the ſon of Coſmo, to the Profeſſorſhip of Eloquence in the Univerſity of Piſa, with emoluments ſo much more conſiderable than thoſe he engaged at Bologna, that he was induced to embrace the offer. He went to Piſa in 1587; and there took the degree of Doctor in the Civil and the Canon Law. In November 1588, he yielded to repeated ſolicitations, by which he was called to the Chair of Eloquence at Rome, which had been kept vacant for him ever ſince the death of his own and his father's friend, Ant. Muretus, in 1585. He removed his whole library from Venice to Rome; had apartments and a table aſſigned to him in the Vatican; and, till the year 1597, continued to live there in good reputation, and

in

in the indefatigable profecution of his literary labours. On the 28th of October, 1597, he died, at the age of fifty years, eight months, and twenty-two days. He was the laſt of his race; all his children having died young, before him.—This is an abſtract of the principal facts in M. Renouard's account of the lives of the three Aldi.

The reſt of this volume is filled with copies of public acts executed in favour of Aldo the elder, by the ſenate of Venice, and by different pontiffs; with copies of Aldo's earlier catalogues; with liſts of the publications of Andrea D'Aſola, of the books printed by Bernard Torregiano at Paris, and of the Lyonneſe counterfeits of the Aldine editions; and with ſeveral other kindred articles of ſufficient importance.

The firſt volume we have choſen to mention after the ſecond; becauſe it is ſimply a catalogue—full indeed, accurate, and interſperſed with many curious bibliographical anecdotes of all the publications which proceeded out of the Aldine preſs from the time of its firſt eſtabliſhment to the death of the younger Aldo.

Of this whole work, we muſt, in candour, acknowledge, that it is evidently executed with diligence, judgment, and taſte, for which its author deſerves great praiſe. It is worthy of the inſpection of every ſcholar. It deſerves a place in every claſſical library. It is, in our opinion, the more commendable for being ſent out without any of thoſe lofty and extravagant pretenſions by which Frenchmen, when they execute a good thing in literature, too often contrive to make us loathe its merits.

Influence de l'Habitude ſur la Faculté de penſer, &c.

The Influence of Habit on the Faculty of Thinking, a Work which gained the Prize on that Queſtion propoſed by the Claſs of Moral and Political Science in the National Inſtitute. By P. Maine Biran. Paris, An. XI. 1802.

THE author ſets out by marking a diſtinction between *ſenſation* and *perception*. He obſerves that though it is obvious that all our impreſſions, of whatever kind, are gradually weakened by continual or frequent repetition, yet while ſome ſeem entirely obliterated by conſtant uſe, others, at the ſame time that they are weakened, not only retain their perſpicuity, but even acquire a greater degree of preciſion. Theſe poſitions are illuſtrated by a number of examples. The whole reſult of which may be fully explained by one which the author has not produced. To the ear that is conſtantly uſed to the repetition of any ſound, as the ringing of bells, the noiſe of a caſcade, &c. the effect in time will be hardly noticed; but let the mind be directed to any ſound, ſo as to try to analyze its particular nature, as in muſical ſounds, the ſame cauſe which weakens the force

of the impetus will enable the ear to examine and analyze with greater accuracy,

This ſubject is purſued, through the greateſt part of the work, with much ingenuity, and accompanied by many happy illuſtrations. The obſervation of the author on the advantages, both the poet and the painter derive from receiving their firſt impreſſions amid pictureſque and romantic ſcenery, are very happy.

"If," he ſays, "ſometimes a ſort of inſtinct of the beautiful, the grand, and the ſublime, of every ſpecies, ſeem to draw the man of genius out of the confined circle of real objects to tranſport him into an imaginary world, where the elements are all of his own creation, and every thing is adorned and arranged according to his own fancy, habit ſtill reſtrains him in his excurſions by a kind of centripetal force. They are the clouds of his native ſky that glow beneath his pencil, it is the earth of his native ſoil that furniſhes the materials with which he builds his enchanted palaces. That perfection of nature which he conceives, which he ſeems to acquire from inſpiration, is nothing more than an ornamented copy, of what firſt attracted his attention, and gave an impulſe to his infant ſenſations."

We have given already an illuſtration of our own, we will now give one of the author's, of the accuracy of *perception* being increaſed by the deficiency of *ſenſation*. "We may recollect the expreſſion of Madame La Sabliere to Le Fontaine, on his noticing a ſcar on her face, after a conſtant habit of intimacy for twenty years. Ah, my friend, you love me no longer. When our minds are animated by any ſentiment at all energetic we diſtinguiſh nothing. We *feel* too much to be able to *perceive*, and when habit has blunted the ſenſations we ſee for the firſt time things as they really are." In this mixture of gallantry with philoſophy we recognize a Frenchman of the old ſchool.

Notwithſtanding this the author makes ſome very judicious remarks on the fatal conſequence of the paſſion of youth being enflamed and prematurely brought forward, by books of a certain tendency, nor do novels, when love is drawn in its moſt ſentimental form, eſcape his cenſure. However unfaſhionable the doctrine may be, we do not entirely diſſent, even as to the laſt article; but the author writes with too free a hand for us tranſcribe.

We wiſh, however, we had no other charge to bring againſt Mr. Biran than freedom of expreſſion employed in a good cauſe; we are ſorry to ſee his work ſtrongly tinctured throughout with that diſlike to revealed religion which is ſo much the characteriſtic of his country. But in this attempt, as muſt always be the caſe when the ſhafts of human wit are directed againſt the impenetrable ſhield of divine truth, his weapons are unavailing; and we may ſay, as the poet ſays of the feeble effort of Priam,

—— Telumque imbelle ſine ictu
Conjecit. ——

Jeſchurun,

Jeſchurun, oder unpartheyiſche Beleuchtung dem Judentheume neuerdings gemachten Vorwurfe. In Brief Von Aaron Wolfsſohn, &c. Breſlaw. Pp. 233. 8vo. 1804.

Or Impartial Expoſition of the lateſt Objections and Reproaches brought againſt Judaiſm and the Jews, &c.

THE Jews are numerous, induſtrious, and rich, in Germany. Yet, they have, there, againſt them, even much more than in England, prejudices of religion, of mercantile jealouſy, of old habitual contempt and diſlike. In this revolutionary age, the Jews have found advocates who inſiſt that all the proſcribing laws againſt them ought to be, in every country, abrogated, as ſhamefully cruel and unjuſt. The Jews claim to be heard by that humanity which ſo ſtrongly pleads in favour of the negroes. But, on the other hand, the prejudices and intereſts of their adverſaries are doubly alarmed, when,—no longer content to enjoy the advantages of ſociety, by ſufferance, and as it were in ſtealth,—the Jews claim to be put, in all reſpects, on an equality with the other ſubjects of the different governments under which they live. They have recently made ſuch claims, in the way indeed of ſolicitation, and with the offer of pecuniary compenſation for the new advantages which they aſk, at Frankfort, and in others of the free imperial cities in Germany. Their rights, their ſufferings, the merits and demerits of their national character, and every topic of odium or favour in their hiſtory, have, in conſequence of theſe incidents, become, of late, in that country, ſubjects of eager literary diſcuſſion. Mr. Wolfsſohn's work now before us, truely deſerves the praiſe of the candid and rational. It will be read with pleaſure by all who take an intereſt in the fate of the Jews, and all who are curious in watching the progreſs and the fluctuations of national prejudice and policy.

Reiſe, Scenee und Abeuthener zu Waſſer, und zu Lande. Von Fredrick Launn. Leipſic. Junius. Price 1 rtlr., 16 gr.

Scenery and Adventures of a Journey, performed by Land and Water. By Frederick Laune, &c. 1804.

THE name of this writer is popular in the light and elegant literature of Germany. From the very title alone of this work, the reader will eaſily conceive it to be a combination of deſcription, remark, and ſentiment, now humorous, now pathetic, ſomewhat in the manner of STERNE. It is preciſely ſuch. We do not deny that it may have afforded good entertainment to German readers of genius. But, we ſhould not think of eagerly recommending it for tranſlation into Engliſh.

Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum; curâ Eichſtadii et Sociorum. M. T. Ciceronis, &c. Epiſtolæ, &c.; edidit Joan Aloys. Martyni-Laguna: M. T. Ciceronis Rhetorica; recenſuit et illuſtravit C. G. Schutz, Vol. I.—Eutropii Breviarium Hiſtoriæ Romanæ; recenſuit, &c. C. H. Tzſchucke. Goſchen. Leipſic. 1804.

THESE are the firſt parts in the publication of a complete and elaborate edition of the works of all the claſſical writers of ancient Rome, which has been commenced, this year, at Leipſic. Eichſtadt and Boettiger are the principal editors. But they are aided by many learned aſſiſtants. In *Cicero's Epiſtles to his Friends* alone, Mr. Martyni-Laguna has, by the diligent collation of manuſcripts and former printed editions, corrected the text in not fewer than four thouſand paſſages. The ſheets are, in the preſs, reviſed again and again, by different men of learning, with all the care which uſed to be exerciſed in the printing-houſes of the Aldi, the Stephens, the Plantins, the Elzevirs, or the Toulis'. The edition is printed, for every author in the collection, in ſeveral forms. The moſt ſumptuous and ſplendid form gives the work in a large type, on a rich vellum paper, in ſmall quarto, with large margins: of this, few copies are printed: and the price is five rixdollars for every ſix-and-twenty ſheets of the copy. The ſame compoſition of types is impreſſed, alſo, on a fine French writing paper, with narrower margins, and in a large octavo form: this is ſold at one rixdollar ſix gr. for every ſix-and-twenty ſheets. The text and notes are, at the ſame time, printed with a ſpecies of neat ſmall types, caſt of purpoſe. Of the copies thus printed, a ſmall number are on a fine paper, hot preſſed, in a ſmall quarto form, and at the price of four rixdollars for every ſix-and-twenty ſheets. A much more conſiderable number are on a good white printing paper, at eighteen gr. for the ſame quantity of ſheets. Such of the claſſics as are in more general uſe in ſchools, are, alſo, printed without the notes, at the ſame price. This undertaking is laubable and magnificent. The execution is, in the parts publiſhed, truely worthy of the deſign. We ſhall be glad to ſee the whole ſucceſsfully completed.

Vollſtandiges Lexicon, der Gartnerey und Botanik; oder Alphabetiſche Beſchreibung vom Wartung und nutzen, &c. Von F. G. Dietrich, Herzogl. Weimars Hofgartner. Vierter Bands. gr. 8 Weimar. Gedickes.

THE Germans are, at this moment, above all other people in the world, they who write of every thing, tranſlate every thing, imitate every thing, invent every thing. There is nothing almoſt in art or nature, with books upon which their preſſes do not teem. The Britiſh nation, the French, the Italians, no ſooner make an improvement in any one branch of human knowledge or exertion, than the

Germans

Germans eagerly make it their own. The number of diſcoveries and inventions which have had their origin in Germany, is perhaps greater than that of the diſcoveries and inventions to which any other country has given birth. And, as Lucilius of old, whether merry or ſad, uſed, upon every occaſion that was particularly affecting to his mind, ſtill to ſummon his briſk but traipſy muſe to extemporaneous verſe-making; ſo that thing is not to be named or thought, that ſhall intereſt a few Germans to-day, and not become the ſubject of a printed book in their language to-morrow.

In thoſe arts eſpecially, and that ſcience, which enable man to improve the natural fertility of the earth, the Germans, if they have not, of themſelves, and as inventors, made, of late, remarkable progreſs, have, however, watched and adopted the improvements of the Engliſh, within theſe laſt forty years, with an aſſiduity and a keenneſs of attention, the moſt admirable and the moſt beneficial. We poſſeſs no work of merit and popularity, on botany, agriculture, or any other branch of rural economy, which the Germans have not made their own by tranſlation. There is ſcarce a practice in gardening or huſbandry which has been in this country approved, that is not already either in common uſe or eager trial in Germany. This *Gardener's Dictionary*, by Mr. *Dietrich*, derives its chief value from the Engliſh materials which it contains. To theſe it, however, adds ſo many particulars of the economy of gardening peculiar to Germany, that, when our author ſhall have completed his work, it will certainly deſerve a place in the library of every Engliſh landholder, farmer, and gardener, who underſtands the German language.

Voyage de trois Mois en Angleterre, en Ecoſſe, et en Irlande pendant l'Eté de l'an IX. (1801, v. *ſt.*) Par Marc-Auguſte Pictet, Profeſſeur de Philoſophie et de Phyſique expérimentale dans l'Académie de Genève, Aſſocié de l'Inſtitut National, Membre des Sociétés Royales de Londres et d'Edinburgh, de l'Athénée de Lyon et de pluſieurs autres Corps littéraires; de la Société de Phyſic et Hiſtoire naturelle de Genève et Préſident de la Société établie dans la même ville pour l'avancement des Arts. A Genève. De l'Impr. de la Bibliothéque Britannique, et ſe trouve chez Manget, J. J. Paſchoud, Libraires; et à Paris, Magimel, Libraire, quai des Aug. No. 73. An XI. (1802, v. ſt.)

A Tour of three Months in England, Scotland, and Ireland, during the Year IX. (i. e. 1801.) By Marc-Auguſte Pictet, Profeſſor of Philoſophy and experimental Phyſics in the Academy of Geneva, &c. &c.

AS the Engliſh reader cannot poſſibly derive any information relative to the ſtate of his own country from the obſervations of a foreigner during a three months tour, a book of this kind can be only intereſting, by ſhewing in what light many of our cuſtoms

and improvements appear to an intelligent ſtranger; and as we conceive that from ſuch obſervations both amuſement and advantage may be derived, we ſhall lay ſome extracts from paſſages of this deſcription before our readers.

The author, who, it appears, had been in England three years before, gives the following account of the alteration he found in our metropolis ſince that time, the letter from which it is taken is dated July 1801.

"I find London much enlarged in three years. The ſtreets and the great *places*, which are called ſquares, advance themſelves into the country towards the north, with a very rapid progreſs; it is a kind of vegetation of that great polypus which torments England. I am told that the population does not encreaſe in proportion with this enormous encreaſe of buildings, and that it is the conſequence of a change of manners. The merchants, who before excluſively inhabited the central part of the town, which is called the city, conſider it now as part of their happineſs to live in another quarter than that where their buſineſs lies; it is poſſible that their health may benefit by it; but certainly it is a faſhion profitable to the architect. A ſmall houſe of three windows in front, with the kitchen under ground (as it always is here), with three ſtories, viz. ground floor, firſt floor, and garret [here the profeſſor omits a ſtorey], with two rooms in a ſtorey, coſts, when finiſhed, 1200 l. ſterling, and if we conſider how money has ſunk in value in England the price is little; but the houſes are in proportion with it, they are built with extreme ſlightneſs, and give ſome uneaſineſs to paſſengers, even at that period when the ſhell only is finiſhed."

Monſieur Pictet gives this deſcription of the ſtage-coaches about the metropolis.

"Public coaches of every ſort, of every form, ſet out every hour for the environs of the capital, and every day for the principal provincial towns; the great roads afford a continual public exhibition. Some carriages have ten places within, and as many on the top. We ſee theſe moving mountains coming at a diſtance, drawn by four horſes only, at a full trot, whom the coachman never whips, and who excite the envy of more than one connoiſeur, by their fine ſhape, their ſhining coat, and their active and bold pace. We ſeem at a diſtance to ſee flags of different colours flying on the roof, they are the ribbons, the aprons, and the petticoats, of thoſe Engliſh women, ſo modeſt in other reſpects, who are not afraid to exhibit themſelves aloft, to the inconvenience of the wind, doubled by the celerity of the vehicle; but the enormous vehicle no ſooner reaches you than it is already at a diſtance, and the eye of the moſt inquiſitive obſerver is diſappointed."

The deſcription is animated, *mais c'eſt un pue Françaiſe.* We have ſoon afterwards an account nearly as long and particular of the mail coaches, we ſhall only quote the introduction. "The invention of the mail coach, in my opinion, is one of thoſe which may indicate a civilization carried to its *maximum.*"

The account the author gives of a Sunday at Holyhead, where he ſtopped, in his return from Ireland, and his reflections on it are ſo good, that we ſhall lay them before our reader without abridgement.

"When

"When I left it," he ſays, "people was at church, for it was Sunday; I met no one in the ſtreets. The tide was out, and one would have been tempted to ſay that the ſhips, lying on their ſides, as they then do, had been alſo obedient to the divine law. On my return, I found all the avenues peopled with walkers of every rank and every age. The day was charming [the author ſays *ſuperbe*], and every body was anxious to profit by it; I met groups of different ſorts, here whole families, there the children, and a little farther the huſband and wife; in every place a population well looking and well dreſſed, their countenances animated by gaiety, and bearing the impreſſion of happineſs. Alas! ſaid I to myſelf, when will this day, this Sunday, ſo welcomed in this country, return to the Chriſtians of France; this day, when the people, uſefully recalled to religious thoughts, by the awful and conſoling ceremonies of public worſhip, find in the employment of the reſt of the day a relaxion, an enjoyment that the idle cannot know, and the neceſſity of which we feel ſo much at preſent? What a happy aſſociation is that of the duties of religion, with the pleaſure of reſt earned by labour! In what new inſtitution will this advantage ever be found? The gaiety of theſe good people made me ſad;—I was jealous for my countrymen."

The laſt ſentence is accompanied by a flattering note of the Editor on the reſtoration of Chriſtianity by Buonaparté.

The author deſcribes alſo the agricultural exhibition at Woburn, and ſpeaks in high terms of the attention and civility he received in this county. Among the perſons whom he praiſes for their hoſpitality and kindneſs, he diſtinguiſhes Sir Joſeph Banks, Mr. Edgworth and his family, in Ireland, and above all Count Rumford, whoſe portrait he has prefixed to the book, and of whoſe houſe and way of living, in Brompton-row, he gives a very circumſtantial account. We ſhall inſert only one ſentence from it. "The houſehold arrangement is managed with the greateſt ſimplicity, and the greateſt regularity; and I cannot even picture to my fancy a life more pleaſant, more *comfortable* (why may we not receive a word which our language wants?) than that which is paſſed there." We anſwer the queſtion thus, becauſe *comfortable* is a word that is not wanted in the language of Frenchmen, ſince it is a feeling of which Frenchmen have never had any idea, and which they ſeem very far from being in the way to acquire.

Fables de Loqman, &c.

Fables of Loqman, ſirnamed the Wiſe: in Arabic; with a French Verſion; and a prefatory Account of that celebrated Fabuliſt. Cairo, printed in the year 1799. A ſmall volume, in 4to.

FABLES are, among all nations, one of the ſpecies of the literature of fancy, which have been the earlieſt and the moſt naturally produced. That ſame ignorance of the Laws of Cauſation, which makes the ſavage and the barbarian to aſcribe every remarkable

phænomenon of nature to the interpoſition of a particular divinity, leads them to attribute to plants and brute animals, the ſame energies of ſentiment and reaſon, of which they were conſcious in themſelves. Trees and wild beaſts are made to ſpeak by nearly the ſame error of judgment and imagination, that peoples the woods with Dryads, Fauns, Satyrs, and huntreſs nymphs, that fancies a god to pour the waters of every ſtream, that places aſſemblies of the gods on the ſummit of every mountain, that looks for indications certainly prophetic of the future, in the flights of birds, or the appearances of the entrails of animals which are ſlain. The origin of apologues and fables, is thus referable to that which has been, every where, the period of the infancy of civil wiſdom.

All ancient literature is full of the praiſes of Pilpay, Loqman, and Æſop. The firſt is ſaid to have been the author of the moſt ancient and the beſt fables in the Sanſcrit literature of India. The ſecond was a Perſian, an Æthiopian, or an Arab, whoſe fables have been preſerved to us, in the language of Arabia. The third was a Phrygian, the ſlave of a Grecian maſter, whoſe chief merit was, perhaps, that of being the firſt to make known in Greek, fables before his time old in the languages of Perſia and other parts of the Eaſt.

This edition of the works of Loqman was executed in the French preſs at Cairo, when the French were lately maſters of Egypt. As an edition diſtinct from others, it poſſeſſes no ſignal merit. It exhibits no *Notitia Literaria* of the work, its preſervation, its fortunes in manuſcript, its firſt printing, and the ſeveral previous editions through which it may have paſſed: It gives no collations of editions and manuſcripts, no various readings, no conjectural emendations. It has but little typographical elegance. The French tranſlation is executed without any conſiderable merit in the reſpects of either cloſe fidelity to the original, or beauty and propriety of French expreſſion.

Yet, the publication deſerves notice, as a ſpecimen of what the French attempted to do, while they were maſters of Egypt. The idea of inſtructing the Arabian Literati in the language of France, by joining a French verſion to a work ſo popular in the Eaſt, as the Fables of Loqman, was far from being ill-conceived. It was very politic employment for the preſs of Cairo, to put it to work upon ſuch a thing as this. Happily, however, the baſeneſs, and worſe than barbarian villainy, which the French, in Egypt, mingled with their policy, were ſuch as to defeat their enterprize in all its parts.

A few uncertain anecdotes of the life of Loqman, are given in the beginning of this ſmall book. The tradition among the Arabians and Perſians, is, that he was an Æthiopian by birth; was brought by the chances of the Slave Trade, from Africa to Judæa; and, being ſold to an Hebrew maſter, there paſſed his life, as a ſhepherd, at the time when he wrote the Fables. The æra in which he flouriſhed, is ſaid to have been, during the reigns of David and Solomon. He is ſaid, in the Eaſt, to have written apologues, parables, and proverbs to the number of 10,000. Some have found plauſible reaſons for ſuppoſing, that

that Loqman and Æſop were the ſame perſon. The Perſian poet *Gelal-edyn* relates; that Loqman, upon an accuſation, that he had ſtolen fruits which he knew to have been eaten by ſome ſlaves, propoſed to his maſter to make both him and them drink, as a teſt, large quantities of hot water; and that the other ſlaves, then vomited the fruits they had ſwallowed, while Loqman, who had taken none, was clearly acquitted by the teſt of the hot water. Waheb, an old commentator on the Koran, mentions Loqman to have been the author of the pointed obſervation, "that the tongue and the heart are the beſt parts of man, and the worſt." The poet *Sády* relates, that Loqman, when adviſed to give wholeſome moral advice to certain robbers who had pillaged him, made anſwer.—"No file can brighten the iron which is entirely conſumed by ruſt." The 31ſt Chapter of the Koran is intituled "The Chapter of Loqman: And Mahomet appears to have availed himſelf of the authority of this ſage, in order to command reſpect to the doctrine of the unity of the Divine Nature. The number of Fables in this collection is 37. They are all well known in European literature.

Nouveaux Memoires Hiſtorique, &c.

New Hiſtorical Memoirs on the Seven Year's War. By M. De Ketrow, ancient Captain in the Service of Pruſſia. Tranſlated from the German. 2 vols. Paris. 1803.

TO write a new Hiſtory of a War, on which ſo much has been already written, ſo as to throw any freſh lights on it, does not ſeem very eaſy: theſe Memoirs, however, are ſo far valuable, as they give the opinion of an eye-witneſs of moſt of the principal events they record; and who, though actually engaged in moſt of the battles, was of ſuch a rank as not to be reſponſible for any of the conſequences, and therefore moſt likely to be impartial in his narrative. What, however, he gains in impartiality, he may loſe in the means of information, as a perſon whoſe exertions are confined to the command of a platoon, can hardly have an opportunity of obſerving the extended and complicated movements of a large army.

The author of this Work, though he praiſes in high terms the military character of Frederick, is not at all ſparing of cenſure on particular occaſions, and ſhews, in many inſtances, that battles were loſt by his raſhneſs and imprudence, and gained by the ſkill of his generals.

Mr. De Ketrow concludes his account of the victory gained by Frederick over the French at Roſbach, with this obſervation on their national military character. "Here the national character of the French was clearly ſhewn; their courage is as eaſily kindled as it is extinguiſhed; they march up to the enemy with the greateſt confidence, but

but ſhould any unforſeen accident happen, they eaſily give themſelves up to deſpondency. Succeſs alone can encourage the French to new victory." To this the author adds in a note, "I had an opportunity, after the battle, to converſe with ſeveral officers of the regiment of Provence: I aſked them how far they thought their army might then be got? 'Really, Sir,' replied one of them, 'I think many of our troops are already arrived in France.' I could not forbear laughing heartily at ſo abſurd an anſwer, but I at the ſame time pitied the ignorance of the Frenchman, who made his defeated countrymen in one night take a leap of 60 or 70 German miles." Here the ſimplicity of the German Captain miſtakes the ſtrong expreſſion by which the Frenchman cenſures the timidity of his countrymen, for a *bona fide* geographical error.

The following anecdotes will ſhew our readers the ideas M. De Ketrow has of the *tragic-comic*; and the *clemency* of the illuſtrious Frederick. After deſcribing the ſanguinary battle of Zorndorf, the author proceeds,

"But, my readers, turning from the bloody picture I have juſt drawn, will, perhaps, be obliged to me for relating a tragi-comic anecdote, which proves, that ſometimes the moſt *pleasant* incidents, will ſuſpend the horrors of the tragic ſcenes of war. When the regiment of the Prince of Pruſſia drove the Ruſſians from Galgengrund, who were firing from behind the trees, a ſoldier of the enemy threw himſelf at the feet of Lieutenant Hagen, crying out, 'Ah, dear Sir, pity me, ſave my life!' Aſtoniſhed to find a Frenchman among theſe barbarian hordes, Hagen aſked him with gaiety, 'What the devil do you do in this curſed place?' He was holding out his hand to the Frenchman, when a non-commiſſioned officer followed him at the ſame moment with his ſword drawn, and laid him dead at the feet of his deliverer. Hagen revolted at this, but he did not dare reproach the non-commiſſioned officer, becauſe orders had been iſſued *to give no quarter*."

Few of our countrymen will find much pleaſantry in this anecdote, any more than they will much humanity in the rigour with which Frederick enforced the order to give no quarter, in the anecdote which immediately follows:—

"Col. Waknitz, having taken under his protection a Ruſſian officer, who had implored his mercy, was leſs patient than Hagen: he ſhot with his piſtol one of the body-guard who attempted to kill the Ruſſian officer, after he had ſurrendered at diſcretion. However juſt the indignation of the brave Waknitz might be, and however excuſable his action was at the tribunal of humanity, it contributed, nevertheleſs, to draw on him that diſgrace which he afterwards received from the king."

As ſo much is known of the public character of Frederick, we ſhall, from the book before us, preſent him in a new light, and as a writer of perſonal ſatire, and, though a monarch and a conqueror, ſuffering in ſome degree from the reſentment of thoſe he ſatirized.

"Frederick amuſed himſelf in the boſom of literature, amid the fatigues of

of war: he kept up a correſpondence with Voltaire, D'Alembert, and ſeveral other celebrated literary characters. His natural taſte for poetry often inſpired him with ſatires, when he made himſelf amends for all the wrongs his enemies had done him, not ſparing them in the leaſt. As he had formerly enflamed the rage of Elizabeth, by a copy of verſes, when he alſo allowed himſelf to irritate Maria Thereſa, by a very cutting ſtroke of calumny, ſo he now addreſſed a very keen invective againſt Choiſeul to Voltaire. Voltaire had the indiſcretion to communicate this to the Miniſter, who never forgave Frederick for the inſult."

We ſhall conclude our account of this article with a relation the author gives of the attempt on the life of the King of Portugal, in the year 1759, which is quite different from every other relation of that extraordinary event.

"It is proved that the Duke D'Aveiras had placed two of his ſervants to fire on the carriage, where the King was wounded, but it was not againſt the monarch that the ſtroke was meant; the blow was intended to fall on Pedro Taxeiro, his valet-de-chambre, who was ſuſpected of having a deſign on the life of the Duke. It was on the carriage of the valet-de-chambre that they fired: it was without any eſcort, and the moment of the attack was exactly that when the King was accuſtomed to preſide at his council. Theſe circumſtances are ſufficient to prove, that the Duke had no deſign to aſſaſſinate the King, even if it were not atteſted by other credible evidences. It unfortunately happened, that the King availed himſelf of the moment, when he was ſuppoſed to be otherwiſe engaged, to viſit his miſtreſs, and made uſe of the carriage of his valet-de-chambre; and by a ſtill more unfortunate accident, one of the balls wounded him in his arm. It was the Marquis de Pombal, prime miniſter, and the King's favourite, who diſcovered the author of this attempt; he was not ignorant that the attempt was directed againſt the valet, and not againſt the King; but his unbounded pride induced him to make uſe of this circumſtance to get rid of the Duke D'Aveiras, and the family of Tavora, whoſe influence gave umbrage to his ambition. He had not much difficulty in perſuading the intimidated monarch that his life had been threatened; and he knew how to give ſo much probability to the pretended plot, that all the world gave credit to it. By theſe means he was the real author of thoſe capital puniſhments which were inflicted on many perſons of the higheſt diſtinction, who were entirely innocent of the crime of which they were accuſed. By this alſo Pombal prepared for the perſecution which the Jeſuits experienced in Portugal, and which ended in their baniſhment from that kingdom. The poſſeſſions of the order, as well as of thoſe who periſhed on the ſcaffold, were confiſcated to the uſe of the Crown, and it was calculated that they amounted to a third of the value of the whole kingdom."

This ſingular event, which appears to belong principally to the hiſtory of Portugal, forms a very ſtriking feature in the general hiſtory of Europe, if we are to look on it as the author ſuggeſts, as the primary cauſe of the abolition, or rather diſperſion of the Jeſuits; to the mixture among the maſs of mankind, of an order of men diſtinguiſhed for their abilities, their intrigue, and their ſway over thoſe who were devoted to them, and deſerted and depreſſed by thoſe governments

vernments which it had before been their intereſt to ſupport, the future hiſtorians of theſe times may, perhaps, impute much of theſe calamities, which have afflicted mankind. Thoſe who have "heads to contrive, tongues to perſuade, and hands to execute any miſchief," were as ready inſtruments for anarchy and atheiſm, as they had been for ſuperſtition and deſpotiſm.

D. Ruhnkenii Elogium T. Hemſterhuſii; et Vita D. Ruhnkenii, Auctore D. Wyttenbachio.—Lugduni Batav. et Amſtelodami. Apud A. et J. Honkoop et P. den Heng ſt. 8vo. Pp. 407. 1800.

Wyttenbach's Life of Ruhnken, &c.

THE contents of this elegant volume are already well known on the continent, and are in no common eſtimation among thoſe who have a true love for claſſical literature, and a diſcerning reverence for the character of a Coryphœus in illuſtrative and emendatory criticiſm. They are the compoſitions of two of the moſt eminent ſcholars that taught at Leyden and Amſterdam in the eighteenth century. They commemorate the lives and ſtudies of three as worthy and ingenious men, as have ever made a figure in Greek and Roman erudition. They include, in great part, the hiſtory of claſſical learning in Holland and Germany, for more than half a century. They are, moreover, enriched with two valuable critical epiſtles by Dr. Richard Bentley, which were never before publiſhed.

The eulogy of HEMSTERHUIS, by *Ruhnken*, is the firſt piece in the volume. It is written with uncommon purity, propriety, and energy of Latin ſtyle. There is, in it, more of the manner and phraſeology of Salluſt, than of any other Latin author. Yet, the author is far from confining himſelf implicitly in it to the mere imitation of Salluſt. There are places in which he ſeems to have derived his inſpiration, in a good meaſure, from Cicero. And his ſentences have often that ſtructure and that diſtinctneſs which belong rather to our beſt compoſitions in the vernacular languages of modern times, than to the claſſical remains of antiquity. This eulogy is, in the whole, for elegance and propriety of compoſition, for vigour of eloquence, for clear diſcrimination of the moral and literary character of the perſon to whoſe memory it is ſacred, for the maxims of moral wiſdom, for the truths in philoſophy, for the principles of rational criticiſm which it involves, inferior to nothing of the ſame kind with which we are acquainted, in any language ancient or modern.

Tiberius Hemſterhuis, the ſubject of this eulogy, was born at Groningen on the 1ſt day of February, 1685. After a ſuitable education in his boyiſh years, he became, at the age of fourteen, a ſtudent in the Univerſity of Groningen. The ſtudy, in which he made there the greateſt proficiency, was mathematics, then taught by the very eminent John Bernoulli. He went thence, to ſtudy "ancient hiſtory," under Perizonius, who, at that time, was very famous for the lectures on that branch of knowledge, which he delivered at Leyden. From Leyden,

Leyden, when ſcarce nineteen years of age, he was called to the Profeſſorſhip of mathematics and philoſophy at Amſterdam. At Amſterdam, he was perſuaded to undertake the completion of an edition of the Lexicon of Julius Pollux, which had been left unfiniſhed by the death of a former editor. This taſk he accompliſhed in a manner, of which he was himſelf at firſt not a little proud, and which procured him much flattering praiſe from the Greek ſcholars of Holland and Germany. But, when, in the joy of his heart, he ſent a copy of his book to Dr. Richard Bentley in London; the Doctor, after peruſing it, ſurprized him with letters, which, though indeed complimentary, ſhewed that the young editor was often exceedingly wrong in his emendatory conjectures, for want of a ſufficient knowledge of the metres and the forms of verſification uſed in the poetry of the ancient Greeks. The worthy and ingenuous Hemſterhuis not only felt and acknowledged that Bentley was every where in the right, but was ſo humbled, and ſo much aſhamed of the infelicity of his own criticiſms, that he ſhut his books in deſpair; and for ſeveral months after, could not endure even to look upon a Greek author. When he returned to his ſtudies in this language, he read with incredible ardour and perſeverance. Beginning with Homer, he peruſed the whole ſeries of Grecian claſſics, downwards, in the order of time, to the lateſt æra of the native culture of Greek literature. He laid none aſide till he had thoroughly ſatisfied himſelf in regard to the ſenſe and the genuineneſs of every paſſage. He applied to all, lights of illuſtration derived from the thorough knowledge of the fundamental principles of thoſe parts of ſcience to which they ſeverally related. He found, in particular, that his early proficiency in mathematics had given a preciſion to his habits of reſearch and diſcernment, which he was enabled to introduce with the greateſt advantage into his philological diſquiſitions, and into his efforts of conjectural emendation. In the year 1717, he accepted an invitation to the Profeſſorſhip of Greek Literature at Franeker. Though he did not ſend much to the preſs, yet his ardour in ſtudy was inſatiable and indefatigable. His lectures diſplayed a copiouſneſs and accuracy of claſſical learning, which were eſteemed to ſet him above all rivalry as a ſcholar. He publiſhed, however, certain "Animadverſions of the Writings of Lucian," which were univerſally acknowledged to add to the learning of a Scaliger and a Salmaſius, more than a double portion of their judgment. And, on the margins of the different books that he peruſed, he was accuſtomed to inſcribe notes, which all his friends and pupils regarded as ineſtimably precious. He accepted, in 1740, an invitation to fill the profeſſorſhip of Greek Literature and Hiſtory in the Univerſity of Leyden. He died on the 7th of April, 1766, in the 82nd year of his age. He was not leſs a proficient in Latin than in Grecian learning. It was his peculiar praiſe, as a ſcholar, that he was neither the bigot of ancient literature, nor an inconſiderate and illiberal enthuſiaſt in that of the moderns excluſively; but illuſtrated to himſelf the obſcurities in the one by lights which he derived from the other. His lectures were

ſomewhat

ſomewhat leſs popular than thoſe of his maſter Perizonius. But his fame was ſo eſtabliſhed, even in his early life, throughout Europe, that, from all parts of the continent, thoſe youths, who aſpired to more than ordinary ſkill in Greek learning, reſorted to profit by his lectures. He was a man of a mild temper, but of remarkable gravity and conſtancy of mind.—Theſe few particulars may give the reader ſome imperfect knowledge of the life and character of Hemſterhuis; but cannot at all repreſent to him the wiſdom and eloquence with which theſe are illuſtrated in the beautiful eulogy of Ruhnken.

The two Critical Epiſtles of Bentley, which were hitherto unpubliſhed, follow next.—The firſt of theſe is without date,—or any other indications to mark the time of its being written, but that Bentley ſpeaks in it of himſelf as then buſy in writing his Notes upon Horace, and reviſing the proof-ſheets, as they came to him from the preſs,—and that he ſignifies himſelf to have not long before received a copy of Hemſterhuis's recently publiſhed edition of Julius Pollux, with a very courteous letter from the editor.—In the firſt emendation which he propoſes, he wiſhes in Pollux ix. 57. to ſubſtitute ῥαθμὸς ῥατὴρ μετὰ ἡδύλου for χρυσῆς ῥατὴρ, &c. upon reaſons of extraordinary ingenuity and erudition. His emendation upon ix. 20. of Pollux, propoſes to ſubſtitute Πυλωρῷ, as the genuine reading, inſtead of Οὐλαύρῳ. He offers, in this epiſtle, though but a ſhort one, ſeveral other emendations, of which the moſt remarkable are deduced from a conſideration of the meaſures and character of the verſes upon which they are propoſed, and all are alike diſtinguiſhed by boldneſs, ingenuity, and aſtoniſhing minuteneſs and preciſion of erudition.

BENTLEY's ſecond letter to Hemſterhuis, was written at London, on the 9th day of June, 1708, in anſwer to one which he had received from the Dutch profeſſor, about a week before, by the hands of a young Daniſh gentleman. Hemſterhuis had received with admiration and reſpect his correſpondent's ſuggeſtions in his former letter, towards the emendation of the text of Julius Pollux. In compenſation, he offered to tranſcribe for Bentley the varieties of reading in a particular manuſcript of Horace which was in a library at Franeker. Bentley had already procured a copy of thoſe readings; and was now deſirous rather to obtain, by the kindneſs of Hemſterhuis, a ſight of the manuſcript itſelf. He was now in poſſeſſion of Hemſterhuis's preſent of a copy of his Julius Pollux; and he could not refrain from praiſing, with enthuſiaſm, the diligence, the erudition, the judgment, the acute perſpicaity, and the careful fidelity, which the young editor had every where throughout the work diſplayed. But he, at the ſame time, heſitated not to ſignify his concern that his young friend had not brought with him, to the taſk, a better ſkill in the proſody and verſification of the ancient Greeks. He then proceeded to evince, by the propoſition of a long ſeries of moſt ingenious conjectural readings of places in Pollux, derived from a particular conſideration of what, in this or that quoted fragment, the laws of the metre required,—that incredible advantage was to be obtained to an editor of this author, from that minute

nute ſkill in the modes and laws of metrical rhythm, which he recommended to his friend with ſo much earneſtneſs. This letter, as well as the former, is a pleaſing evidence of Bentley's kind and good-natured intercourſe with foreign literati, as well as of the reverence with which they regarded him.

The life of *Ruhnken*, by *Wyttenbach*, fills the laſt and greateſt part of this volume. It is written with diffuſion of ſtyle and ſentiment, with elegance of phraſeology, with a fond and yet diſcriminating diſplay of Ruhnken's character, and of the incidents of his life, but occaſionally with prolix digreſſions, in which the author exhibits more of the ſchoolmaſter and the old woman, than of the man of ſtrong common ſenſe, or of clear, enlarged philoſophical intelligence. With the narrative of the life of Ruhnken, he involves in his compoſition ſo many particulars of the hiſtory of claſſical literature on the continent, for the whole period during which Ruhnken flouriſhed, as to render the work much more extenſively intereſting than if it had been confined to a meagre eulogy of Ruhnken alone.

DAVID RUHNKEN was born at Stolpe in Pomerania, on the 2d day of January, 1723. His parents, being in good circumſtances, and of the better order of the burgeſſes, deſtined him, from his early years, for the church. After receiving ſome inſtruction at the ſchool of Stolpe, in the principles of his mother-tongue, he was ſent firſt to Schlave, and afterwards to Kœnigſberg, for education in the claſſical languages. Emanuel Kant was his ſchool-fellow at Kœnigſberg. At the age of 22, he had finiſhed the uſual courſe of ſcholaſtic claſſical education. With difficulty, he then obtained his father and mother's conſent to repair to Goettingen, and ſtudy Greek under Matthew Geſner, then the great ornament of that univerſity. On his way to Goettingen, he paſſed through Berlin, and went to viſit the Saxon univerſity of Wittenberg. There he was ſo much pleaſed with the lectures and converſation of J. D. Rutter, profeſſor of hiſtory and civil law, and of J. W. Berger, profeſſor of Roman eloquence and antiquities, that he perſuaded his parents to allow him to continue his ſtudies for ſome time at Wittenberg, before he ſhould proceed to Goettingen. He remained under theſe profeſſors, two years; and, under their auſpices, took a degree in laws. He went then, by the encouragement of his friends at Wittenberg, though not with the entire good will of his parents, to perfect his knowledge of Greek, not with Geſner at Goettingen, but under a man ſtill more famous, Hemſterhuis of Leyden. Hemſterhuis received this ingenuous youth with great kindneſs, gave him the readieſt aſſiſtance in his favourite ſtudies, recommended him to good employment as a tutor, and at length uſed every means to ſecure his appointment to a profeſſorſhip in the Univerſity in which he himſelf taught. Ruhnken applied with unabating zeal to Greek and Roman literature; and, at the ſame time, made himſelf highly acceptable by the gentleneſs of his manners, by the livelineſs of his converſation, and by his taſte and ſkill in the favourite amuſements, to all the good ſociety to which he was introduced in Holland. His firſt printed diſplay of critical

tical Greek erudition, was, in an epiſtle upon certain Greek commentaries on the Title in the Digeſt, *De Advocatis et Procuratoribus.* He gave next, at Hemſterhuis's perſuaſion, an edition of the Greek Lexicon of Timæus, for the illuſtration of words and phraſes of which the uſe is peculiar to Plato. In the year 1755, he went to viſit Paris, with a view chiefly to the inſpection of the libraries in that city, and to examine what manuſcript treaſures of ancient literature they might yet contain. In a year's reſidence in that metropolis, he paſſed moſt of his time in the King's library, and in that of the Benedictines of St. Germains-in-the-fields; tranſcribed a number of unprinted remains of ancient literature; and collated many manuſcripts and rare editions of the moſt popular claſſical authors. At length, he was, in the month of October, 1757, called to the exerciſe of reader in Greek literature, and thus aſſiſtant to Hemſterhuis in the Univerſity of Leyden. Upon the death of Œudendorp, profeſſor of Latin eloquence and hiſtory, he obtained the chair which that eminent ſcholar had filled. In the year 1763, he married Mariamne Heirmans, a young lady of uncommon beauty and accompliſhments, the daughter of a gentleman who had long reſided as Dutch conſul at Leghorn. He diſcovered, in his ſubſequent ſtudies, a valuable fragment, before unknown to modern ſcholars, of the treatiſe of Dionyſius Longinus "On the Sublime,"—which was, by his favour, afterwards publiſhed in Toup's excellent edition of that work. On the death of his old maſter Hemſterhuis, he did juſtice to his memory in the noble eulogy, of which the reader has already peruſed an abſtract. He gave, ſoon after, an elaborate edition of the rhetorical treatiſe of Rutilius Lupus. In 1779, he publiſhed the valuable fruit of much learned labour, in his edition of the Roman Hiſtory of Velleius Paterculus. Next year, he gratified the learned world with the Hymns of Homer. One of his laſt labours was, the ſuperintending of a new edition of Scheller's Latin Dictionary. He taught, with the greateſt ſucceſs, in his profeſſorſhip. He was, all his life, fond of the chace, and curious in dogs. He died on the 14th of May, 1798, in the 76th year of his age. The government aſſigned a penſion of 500 florins a year to his widow and two daughters who ſurvived him.

Such are the principal contents of this elegant volume, one of the fineſt monuments we have lately ſeen of the ſucceſsful culture of claſſical literature in modern Batavia.

P. F. Suhm's Geſchichte der Danen: Ins Deutſche Ubertragen; von Fr. D. Grater. 1 B. in 2 abth. 8vo. 3 Rthlrs.

Suhm's Hiſtory of the Danes; tranſlated into German, by Fr. D. Grater. Leipſic. 1804.

SUHM is the moſt learned and ſatisfactory of the writers of the hiſtory of Denmark. He has illuſtrated, with prodigious reſearch, the early ſuperſtitions, the piratical enterprizes, the manners, the

the cuſtoms, and all the antiquities of that which may be called the heroic age of the Danes. He has, with equal ability and care, traced the fortunes and exertions of his nation, down through the leſs diſtant periods of its exiſtence. His diſcernment and taſte are, indeed, not always equal to his honeſt dilligence; and he adopts, often haſtily, every tale in the fabulous hiſtory of foreign countries, in which the Danes are mentioned with honour. But his work is known, both to his own countrymen and to foreigners, as the beſt hiſtory of Denmark that has yet been publiſhed. Mr. Grater has tranſlated that part of this work which relates to the fabulous times. Perhaps an Engliſh tranſlation, of that part of it, at leaſt, might be not ill received.

Oeſterreiſches Magazin fur Armenhulfe, &c.

Auſtrian Magazine of Inſtructions for bettering the Condition of the Poor, improving Eſtabliſhments of Induſtry, and ameliorating the Manners and Situation of Servants. Compiled by J. W. Klein, Director of the Poor. Vienna, Geiſtingers. Hoffmans, Hamburgh. 1804.

THE deſign of this work is nearly ſimilar to that of the laudable publications of our Society for bettering the Condition of the Poor. It conſiſts of authentic narratives, for the greater part, original, of the inſtitution, arrangements, and ſucceſs of eſtabliſhments of public induſtry and beneficence, in Germany and other countries. Such eſtabliſhments exiſt no where in greater numbers, nor under better regulations, perhaps, than in the Auſtrian dominions, and particularly in the city of Vienna. By deſcribing merely what is peculiar to the character and hiſtory of the charitable and induſtrious inſtitutions under his own inſpection, Mr. Klein may render his magazine highly uſeful to the ſcience of public œconomy, and to the general cauſe of humanity. Its publication commenced in May laſt. A number, containing ſix ſheets, is publiſhed every two months; and three numbers are to make a volume, We ſhould think, that it may not be unworthy of the particular attention of thoſe excellent perſons who are ſo aſſiduous in collecting and diſſeminating information to improve the virtues and comforts of the poor in our own country.

Hiſtoire de la Ruſſie, réduit aux ſeuls faits Importans. A Londres, et ſe trouve a Paris. F. Buiſſon. An. X. (1802.)

Hiſtory of Ruſſia, reduced only to the important Events. Printed in London, but to be got at Paris.

THE aſſertion that this work is printed in London is confuted at the firſt glance, by the paper and the print, as the vileſt traſh

of Grub-ſtreet is never printed in ſuch a form, as diſgraces ſome of the beſt publications of Germany and of France; not that we claſs the book before us with theſe, for a more ſtupid effort of arrogance and malice has ſeldom fallen under our inſpection as critics. The author profeſſes to be the moſt impartial and diſcriminating of all hiſtorians, and every ſentence ſhews him the moſt partial and the moſt indiſcriminating, both in his praiſe and in his cenſure. One of the canons he lays down to hiſtorians is, that they ſhould neither incline to monarchy nor to a republic; and the whole work is an invective againſt monarchs and monarchy; but its principal object is to oppoſe every thing that Voltaire ſays of Peter the Great, and to vilify the character of that prince. Of the candour with which he conducts his philippic, the opening of the character of Peter affords a notable ſpecimen. Voltaire, to raiſe the character of his hero, by ſhewing how his deſire to form a navy in Ruſſia induced him to conquer his natural antipathies, tells us he had, from his birth, ſuch a dread of water as to be almoſt in convulſions at paſſing over a ſmall brook; of this, whether true or falſe, our hiſtorian makes the following curious uſe. "Peter the firſt, called the Great, had this in common with all rabid animals, he could not bear the ſight of water; he had not the ſame diſlike either to blood or to ſtrong liquors." When Peter entertained the Swediſh officers, who were made priſoners at the battle of Pultowa, at his table he drank a glaſs of wine to the health of *his maſters in the art of war*; this has been generally conſidered as a generous compliment to the courage and conduct of thoſe whom the fortune of war had put into his power; but this candid gentleman obſerves on it, that "a generous conqueror, and one deſerving of his ſucceſs, would not have ſuffered ſuch a bravado to have eſcaped him;" on the ſame principle he might have cenſured the behaviour of the Black Prince after the victory of Poiters.

Still anxious to depreciate the character of Peter, when the author mentions the delivery of the Ruſſian army from its difficulty, by following the advice of the Empreſs, and bribing the lieutenant of the Vizer, he adds this wiſe remark. "A Greek or a Roman hero would have ſent Catharine to her diſtaff, and would have periſhed, with all his army, after ſelling his life dearly, rather than redeem it by ſuch diſgraceful means." A noble proof to be ſure of the patriotiſm of a monarch to ſacrifice an army to ſecure his own reputation; the Romans had other notions of patriotiſm; when the Roman army was inveſted by the Samnites at the Straits of Candium, and they had no alternative but to ſell their lives in this manner, or undergo the diſgraceful ceremony of paſſing under the yoke, one of the conſuls ſaid, in ſupport of the latter meaſure, and his advice was followed, Ea eſt caritas patriæ ut tam ignominiâ eam quam morte ſi opus ſit ſervemus.

Of the author's piety we bring the following proof, where he condeſcends to quote Voltaire, whoſe authority as an hiſtorian he has been always queſtioning; ſpeaking of religious perſecution under the Empreſs Elizabeth, he adds in a note, "Before the happy days of civilization,

lization, theſe ſcourges were not known. For a conſiderable time," ſays Voltaire, "in more than one province of Ruſſia all kind of religion was unknown."

This author is not very correct in his dates, in page 331 he tells us, the firſt appearance of Catharine to the ſoldiers at the commencement of the revolution which deprived Peter III. of his throne and life, was the eighth of July 1762; and in page 336, we have a declaration of Catharine to the people, after ſhe had ſucceeded to the throne, and Peter was dead, dated July 7th, 1762.

At the end of the book, a paper is printed, under the title of "The good and laſt advice of Catherine II. to Paul I. found among the papers of the Empreſs of Ruſſia after her death." Whether this is genuine or a forgery we are by no means clear; it is certainly brought forward with a view to hurt the character of Catharine. But though there are many pieces of advice in it that appear to us neceſſary for the peaceful government of an empire ſo extended as Ruſſia, we conceive to ſo violent an enthuſiaſt for popular ſway as the author, they may ſeem groſs infringements on the *rights of men.* We will conclude this article with a paſſage from the paper, which we are ſure does not meet the approbation of the perſon who prints it, whether he be author or only reporter; but we truſt it will be congenial with the wiſhes of moſt of our readers.

"I hope that, faithful to my plans, the Ruſſian Eagle will extend her powerful wings, to go and deſcend on that guilty country, where the blood of a king has been ſhed by the hands of his people. My ſon, ſwear on my tomb, ſwear by the manes of your mother, that you will fulfil my promiſes. I have deferred the accompliſhment of them for political reaſons, which you well know how to appreciate. Let not your armies be put in motion for this diſtant expedition till the epoch of the decline of that infant republic, which grew weak immediately on its birth. Let her commit every crime, both within her own boundaries and beyond her frontiers; when ſhe hath invaded, plundered, ravaged, all her neighbours; when ſhe has become their execration; when, impoveriſhed by her triumphs, exhauſted by her victories, a prey to anarchy, ſhe no more knows how to govern others than to govern herſelf, then, my ſon, the moment is arrived to pour your thunder on her."

Ruſſiſche Miſcellen. Herauſgegeben, Von Joh. Richter. No. VI. oder 21en. Bandes 3tes. Heft.

Ruſſian Miſcellanies, publiſhed by John Richter. No. VI. or 2d Vol. 3d Part. June, 1804.

RICHTER's ſkill in Ruſſian literature is advantageouſly known, by his German tranſlation of the travels of Karamſin. That tranſlation has, indeed, been repreſented as the original, in the *Edinburgh Review,* a work of which the preſumptuous ignorance, the petulant taſteleſſneſs, the incredible blunders, the lumpiſh dullneſs

would not, even for the ſake of its virulent ſlander, be endured in any other country in Europe but Great Britain. Mr. *Richter's* ſucceſs as a tranſlator encouraged him, ſome time ſince, to attempt the periodical publication of theſe Ruſſian Miſcellanies. His plan is, to intermingle with tranſlations and abſtracts of works originally Ruſſian, eſſays and memoirs originally German, on every ſubject of curioſity in the Ruſſian hiſtory and literature. The former numbers of his work we have not ſeen. The contents of this one are not unintereſting. The firſt article is, "Marfa Poſſadniza, or the Conqueſt of Novogorod, a tale, by Karamſin, book third."—Next follow, "Two Letters on Ruſſia, from a German, reſident in Moſcow, to his Friends in Leipſick." The third piece is, "Poor Daſcha: a tale, from the Ruſſian of Paul Lwow." The fourth article is upon "Nandru's Ruſſian Grammar." To this ſucceeds "A ſketch of a Hiſtory of Siberia, by Profeſſor Schlozen of Moſcow." It is followed by an account of "the moſt remarkable Novelties in Ruſſian Literature." The laſt article in this number is, "The Cunning Gypſie, a Ruſſian tale."—Our readers may perceive, by this enumeration of the contents of one number of Mr. Richter's Miſcellany, that it has in it abundant matter of inſtruction and amuſement to all who are curious to mark the progreſs of Ruſſian genius, who delight in works of fancy, or who deſire to mark with philoſophic eye all the varying lights and ſhades of national manners.

Ruſsland unter Alexander dem Erſten.—Ruſſia under Alexander I. A periodical Miſcellany of the Hiſtory of Ruſſia. The Editor, H. Storch. No. V. 1804.

STORCH is well known as the author of ſome excellent works on the Hiſtory of Ruſſia, and on the preſent economy of civil and political ſociety in that empire. The ſubſtance of his beſt works on theſe ſubjects has been incorporated in the Engliſh compilations of the Rev. W. Tooke. The following are the contents of this fifth number of his Periodical Miſcellany of the Hiſtory of Ruſſia: Rights and Privileges of different Orders in the Empire reſtored and extended, by Alexander I.; State of the Univerſity of Dorpat, from January to November 1803; new Regulations and new Conditions of the Academy of Sciences in St. Peterſburgh; Eſtabliſhment of an upper Seminary of Inſtruction in the Principles of the Catholic Religion, in the Univerſity of Wilna; Inſtitution of Three Schools for Veterinary Medicine, in St. Peterſburgh, Moſcow, and Lubny; ancient and modern Riga, an hiſtorical Parallel by Dr. Dyrſon; of the Banks for Loans, recently eſtabliſhed in the provinces of Livonia and Eſthonia; honourable and patriotic Tranſactions; Miſcellanies. Theſe ſeveral articles are, for the greater part, extracts from the Ruſſian newſpapers, or tranſlations of pieces in a monthly miſcellany, which is now in a train of publication in Ruſſia, and in the Ruſſian language, by

by M. Ceſarakowſky. The compilation of the work, is, to judge from this number, directed by taſte and good judgment. We have read it over, with unabated curioſity and ſatisfaction. It deſerves, as well as the ſubject of the article immediately preceding, the particular notice of all who, without ſkill in the Ruſſian language, may be deſirous to acquaint themſelves with Ruſſian manners and affairs.

Adraſtea. Von J. G. Herder. No. XII. Hamburgh.

IT is common to give the appellation of *Fugitive Pieces* to ſuch ſhort compoſitions as uſually fill our periodical miſcellanies, as if publiſhed ſingly, might be ſcattered and loſt like ſo many Sibylline leaves, and would not have bulk to occupy any remarkable place on the ſhelves of our libraries. But, Herder has not ſcrupled to arrogate to his periodical miſcellany an higher title. In a word, borrowed from a language in the literature of which he is known to be admirably ſkilful, he denominates the materials of which we have quoted the name, not *Fugitive*, but *Non-fugitive Pieces*. The following are the titles of the ſeveral articles which fill this twelfth number: 1. Poetry—Queries—German Greatneſs—Letters reſpecting the particular Character of the German Language. 2. Idea of a patriotic Inſtitute adapted to the Genius of all Germany—Flexible Energies of Manhood—Thoughts from the Engliſh of Swift, with a Supplement of additional Thoughts—Berkley—Thoughts extracted from the Writings of Berkley—Night. 3. *Aurora*, or the Day-ſpring of a new Century. 4. The laſt Song of Oſſian, by Knebel.—This publication draws many of its materials from the claſſical and philoſophical literature of England, which is, we believe, better underſtood, and more highly valued, in Germany, than in any other foreign country. We do not certainly know whether a periodical miſcellany of ſuch compoſition could be publiſhed with great ſucceſs in London. But we know Herder to be one of the moſt eloquent, and the moſt admired, writers in Germany. And we doubt not but reaſon, taſte, and fancy, muſt predominate, in a judicious adaptation to the popular humour, throughout all the numbers of a work of which he is the editor,

Wilhelm Tell: Ein Schauſpiel. Von Veit Weber, &c.—*William Tell, a Drama.* By Veit Weber; with Tell's Portrait, three Vignettes, and a Cover ornamented with elegant wooden Cuts. Berlin. 1804. Price, on Engliſh Printing Paper, 1 Rixdollar and 8 Gr.; on Swiſs Paper, 1 Rixdollar 20 Gr.; on Vellum Paper, 2 Rixdollars.

A WILD mixture of the ſublime and the terrible with the pathetic predominates in the beſt tragedy of the Germans. They delight to imagine ſuch complications of diſtreſs, as it is barely within the poſſibilities of fancy, for us to conceive, but not or ſcarcely poſſible, that

that the realities of life ſhould ever exhibit. They arm fortune and the chances of life with a power more terrible and more fantaſtic than theſe have ever yet been known to exerciſe. They attribute to men energies and weakneſſes of reaſon, as well as maddened extremities in the workings of all the paſſions, tender or furious, gay or ſorrowful, which it is not in human nature to ſuffer or diſplay. They chuſe, for imitation, even where they approach the neareſt to the truth of nature, ſuch ſcenes, characters, paſſions, and turns of fortune, as are of things actually happening, the rareſt, and the moſt, to uſe a common form of expreſſion, out of nature. Theirs is the romance of dramatic writing, remote alike from the chaſte and claſſical imitations of nature in the drama of the Greeks, and from the leſs chaſtened, more irregular, yet not leſs faithful and forcible, imitations of the ſame nature, in the older drama of the Engliſh ſchool. WEBER is known by ſome romances, in which the ſpells of witchcraft, and all the reſources of the marvellous, are very boldly, and not unſkilfully nor unſucceſsfully employed. In the choice of the ſtory of *Tell*, the ſuppoſed author of the Liberties of Switzerland, for the ſubject of a tragedy, Mr. Weber, no doubt, acted with a diſpoſition to produce a romantic drama, of which the fable and ſentiments ſhould be accomodated to the prevailing humour of the preſent age. The ſtory of Tell is naturally popular in a time of revolutions excited by a deſire of genuine or miſtaken liberty. It ought to be more than popular at a period when all Europe mourns to have recently witneſſed the ill ſucceſs of efforts for the defence of Swiſs freedom, which, though leſs ſeaſonable, were, in the laſt criſis, not leſs generous and heroic, than thoſe of Tell and his brave companions. The drama of Weber has been much approved in Germany, both when read and in its repreſentation on the ſtage. Had it been leſs a general favourite, the bookſeller would ſcarce have ventured to publiſh it with ſuch ſplendid ornaments, or in ſuch a diverſity of forms. To thoſe who are willing to bear with the peculiarities of taſte and moral ſentiment, which now diſtinguiſh the German dramatic ſchool, it will not be unacceptable, even in this country. But we will not diſſemble, that it is not pure from a daſh of two things which we exceedingly diſlike—BOMBAST and JACOBINISM.

Anſichten des Rheins. Vom Prof. Nic. Voight. Frankfort am Mayn. 1804.

Views on the Rhine, &c.

THIS is a publication in which elaborate deſcriptions of a ſeries of the fineſt and moſt pictureſque views of river ſcenery in Europe are combined with admirable engraven repreſentations of them. The work is publiſhed in numbers, and in both French and German, at the ſame time. Eleven of the engravings, with their reſpective

reſpective deſcriptions, had been given to the public, in the beginning of June laſt. The price of theſe was, for the beſt paper, ſeven rix-dollars and twelve gr. We take notice of this publication chiefly that we may here remark, how the pen and the pencil join in the ſervice of taſte and elegant public amuſement, in Germany juſt as in England.

Encyclopædia der Philoſophie, mit Letterariſchen Notizen. Von Prof. Joh. Heinr. Abicht, &c.

Encyclopædia of Philoſophy, with Literary Notices. By Profeſſor John Henry Abicht. Publiſhed by Fr. Wilmans, Frankfort, on the Mayne. Price 1 Rixdollar 18 Gr.

ENCYCLOPÆDIA has become one of thoſe titles which are the moſt ambitiouſly, and the moſt ridiculouſly, abuſed by book-makers. Its meaning, properly, is *inſtruction in a circle,*—a *circle of inſtruction*, or a *ſyſtem of knowledge complete and perfect, as the circle is eſteemed, in mathematics, to be among other figures.* The firſt application was among the Greeks, and by the Latins, when they affected to beſprinkle their vernacular compoſitions with Greek phraſes, to denote compendious collections of the elements of knowledge, ſomewhat ſimilar to thoſe which now bear the ſame learned name. It had been uſed occaſionally by the moderns, but not exalted to popularity, before the publication of the famous *Encyclopædia*, the work of *Diderot*, *D'Alembert*, and their aſſociates. *Ephraim Chambers* had, contrary to analogy, and the rules for the compoſition of words, uſed *Cyclopædia* in the ſame ſenſe in the title of his compilation, which the French philoſophers adopted, as the baſis of theirs; and the learned *William Bowyer* had pointed out the impropriety of *Chambers's* title, but without being able to perſuade him to correct it. The correction propoſed by *Bowyer*, and the example of the literati of France, did not eſcape the obſervation of the Scottiſh printers, who vamped up the firſt editions of what has been called *Encyclopædia Britannica.* By a curious and general union of the moſt undiſtinguiſhing ignorance, with a ſharkiſh rapacity for knowledge, the Scottiſh compilation, though made up by the meaneſt and moſt illiterate of mankind; and though in every page thick ſown with blunders; obtained a reception and a celebrity, ſuch as only the nobleſt and moſt unexceptionable productions of genius and literary labour ought to win. The extenſive diffuſion of the French *Encyclopædie*, and of the Scottiſh *Encyclopædia*, has given a popularity to the name that makes book-making booksellers to regard it as a charm, under the protection of which, any traſh they can bundle together may find a ſale. We have ſeen in London a moſt eminent diſplay of *dullneſs* under the title of an *Encyclopædia of Wit.* And Mr. ABICHT muſt be acknowledged to evince any thing rather than a ſkill in ſcience, in this German *Encyclopædia of Philoſophy.*

Haupt-Momente dar Kritiſche Philoſophie. Eine Reihe von Vorleſungen, &c.

Chief Principles of that Philoſophy (Kant's) which conſiſts only in Determinations of the Judgment. A Series of Lectures read before a ſelect Audience.

NEVER were opinions more ignorantly praiſed or blamed, embraced or abhorrently rejected, than thoſe of Emanuel Kant. Before he began to ſpeculate for himſelf in thoſe general elements of all ſcience, which conſtitute metaphyſics or the firſt philoſophy, he had, with diligence and maſterly penetration, ſtudied the ſyſtems of other metaphyſicians and philoſophers, from Plato and Ariſtotle to Leibnitz, Wolfius, Hume, Condillac, and Voltaire. Immerſed in theſe ſtudies, his mind had become too much a ſtranger to thoſe familiar ideas, objects of alluſion, and modes of ſpeech, which form, in ordinary communication, and in elegant literature, the common media of mutual converſe between man and man. He breathed only the air of the regions of metaphyſics. He ſpoke, he thought, only in the language peculiar to his maſters. Metaphyſics, like mathematics, aſpires to expreſs, and to deduce its truths, in a manner as free as poſſible from metaphor, from digreſſive illuſtration, and from all the looſeneſs of vulgar phraſeology: and Kant's writings are in general in the direct, cloſeſt, and moſt technical manner of metaphyſics. He was obliged to follow the analogy of thelanguage of Wolfius, then the moſt prevalent in the German ſchools: but he applied it according to his own peculiar notions, and gradually made from it a ſort of new dialect, differing widely enough even from Wolfius's terms, and yet more a-kin to theſe than to thoſe of any other ſyſtem of the firſt general elements of philoſophy. Thus, what with peculiarity of language, originality of views, and ſcholaſtic abſtraction of thought, Kant, as he gradually ripened into a profeſſor and an author, became unavoidably ſuch in his caſt of ſpeculation and writing, that it was ſcarce poſſible for him not to be above all his contemporaries, the moſt difficult to be rightly underſtood. Even Ariſtotle is to him, perhaps, for abſtruſeneſs, but as a *Primer* or a *Reading made Eaſy* to a *Syſtem of Fluxions*.

Yet though from ſuch cauſes, ſo obſcure in his writings, Kant eminently deſerves the praiſe of a philoſopher, and a man of good intentions. His primary objects were,—like that of BACON, to eſtabliſh one grand ſyſtem of knowledge and reſearch,—like that of *Beattie*, *Reid*, and *Buffier*, to diſpel the miſts and break the ſpells of metaphyſical ſcepticiſm. He began with dividing all knowledge or ſcience into two great ſpecies of truths; *truths* which, whether of *relation* or of *ſubſtantial exiſtence*, we know intuitively, or are, by a neceſſity of our nature, compelled to believe, without the formal demonſtration of reaſon and experiment; and *truths* which we are formed to learn from experiment and induction only, and which are but varieties, new modifi-

modifications, dependent relations, of the former. The knowledge, the diſcriminating knowledge of all the truths of the firſt ſpecies, was, in his judgment, the beginning of common ſenſe, the true firſt philoſophy. The different ſciences were formed, and, upon theſe, in his mind, the various arts eſtabliſhed, when men, by reaſoning and experiment, learned how the truths of the firſt ſpecies expanded and ramified themſelves into all thoſe of the ſecond. He accounted it to be the proper buſineſs of a philoſopher, to diſtinguiſh theſe two ſpecies of truths properly from each other, and after a due knowledge of their differences, and a clear, familiar, and indelible apprehenſion of all thoſe of the former ſpecies, to inquire, through life, with unabating ardour and diligence for the diſcovery of all thoſe which may belong to the ſecond ſpecies. Such was the taſk which he preſcribed to himſelf, as a philoſopher, and ſuch the ſcope of all his labours.

Thus far the philoſophy of KANT is, in its deſigns and principles, wiſe and good. But in his firſt ſort of truths,—truths either intuitively certain, or ſuch that without admitting them, we could neither reaſon nor act; he comprehends ſeveral which are not intuitively clear or certain, and which we are not under any natural neceſſity of embracing without proof. He exalts the power of unreaſoning ſentiment, at times, much too high in philoſophy. In his deductions of the truths which he accounts to be tentative and experimental, he is ſometimes too bold, ſometimes too timid, he ſacrifices accuracy of reaſoning often to prejudices and dreams of his own, not ſeldom to a reverence for thoſe of his maſters, or to a not ungenerous admiration of the fanciful theories of his contemporaries. He often errs, becauſe he affects a march too grand and gigantic for his powers; would expand his gaze over a field far too wide for his ſurvey; would ſeize a maſs infinitely too vaſt and ponderous for his graſp. Yet, his views are ever large and comprehenſive; his methods of reaſoning and inference are legitimately logical: his diſtinctions are every where made with aſtoniſhing acuteneſs and preciſion. There is nothing in his whole ſyſtem but what tends to evince that he was, at leaſt, in intention, no jacobin in morals and politics, no infidel in religion.

But never philoſopher, if not perhaps Ariſtotle, was more unfortunate than KANT, in his admirers and diſciples. It was the peculiar obſcurity and apparent myſticiſm of his manner that raiſed his philoſophy firſt into notice. Its ſubſtitution of the evidence of ſentiment, in ſome remarkable inſtances, for that of experiment and reaſoning, gave it an additional charm. It became farther important to the multitude, as touching upon ſuch a wide diverſity of topics. The wild originality of his opinions upon ſome heads important in their relations to practice, was delightful to the giddy followers of novelty. Being admirably right in ſome things, admirably wrong in others; hence, even they who were not incompetent to underſtand and judge his merits, came to be ſome his enthuſiaſtic panegyriſts, others his fierce and contemptuous opponents; a diviſion of opinions and wiſhes

which

which could not but provoke loud diſputation, and ſo contribute, at leaſt, to the general notoriety of his ſyſtem. By all theſe means, he has become famous and popular without being underſtood. His own books on the different parts of his philoſophy have been written with an obſcurity ſo peculiarly his own, as to be fit for ſcarce any other uſe, than to ſerve as private memoranda, auxiliary to his own recollection. All who have attempted to defend his ſyſtem, and facilitate the intelligence of it, have found, in its obſcurity, an excuſe for corrupting and miſrepreſenting it. Its adverſaries have, under a ſimilar pretence, taken the ſame advantage.

KANT's doctrines have been egregiouſly miſrepreſented by all the quackiſh Germans who have pretended to talk and write about them, as his diſciples in England. We cannot recommend the tranſlation of this German abſtract, as what would make them more faithfully and uſefully known here.

REVIEWERS REVIEWED.

Dr. GLEIG's SERMONS *and* THE CHRISTIAN OBSERVER.

WE acknowledge ourſelves no regular readers of the publication called "The Chriſtian Obſerver;" and, from what we have ſeen of it, we feel ourſelves little inclined to become ſo. It cannot have eſcaped the notice of thoſe who are at all attentive to "the ſigns of the times," that, of late, very ſtrong indications have appeared of a ſyſtematic and extenſive plan, for the purpoſe of reviving, and rendering triumphant among us, the Calviniſm, Puritaniſm, and Antinomianiſm of the 17th century. There have always, we believe, been perſons within the pale of our Church, who profeſſed and propagated theſe pernicious opinions. But, in former times, we ſee them acting independently and ſeparately; aiming at their object by individual exertion. At preſent they appear to have concentrated their forces, and, under the arrogant deſignation of "THE TRUE CHURCHMEN," to have entered into a well-compacted body, with the expreſs deſign of converting the nation to the principles of Calviniſtic Methodiſm, and of leaving no means in their power unemployed to perſuade the people that ſuch were the genuine original principles of our venerable Church. With God's aſſiſtance we firmly truſt that the labours of this dangerous UPSTART SECT, as the Dean of Peterborough juſtly terms them, will ultimately prove abortive; but, in order that they may, the friends of the Church muſt not be idle. This combination of ſpurious Churchmen, who are making inroads, in all directions, on her moſt eſſential and fundamental doctrines, muſt be met at every corner, and repulſed. The patrons of Calviniſtic Methodiſm, notwithſtanding their affected confidence of victory, did not probably expect to conquer without a ſtruggle; though, unleſs we are deceived by falſe intelligence, they did not expect, in ſo ſhort a time, ſo vigorous a check as they have already experienced. Let the Church of England be but true to herſelf, and the event cannot be doubtful. Her champions have every advantage on their ſide; for their cauſe is the cauſe of truth and of ſoberneſs, while that of their antagoniſts is the cauſe of error, of fanaticiſm, and of nonſenſe. Thoſe who maintain the Anti-Calviniſm of our Church

Church ſtand, indeed, on ground from which they can never be diſlodged, but in conſequence of their own proper treachery, negligence, or cowardice. If faithful to their truſt, they are invincible. In the preſent caſe, then, let not the conduct of our national clergy be produced as a proof of what has been often advanced as a general poſition, that the defenders of eſtabliſhments are always leſs ardent and indefatigable than their aſſailants. Above all, let it not be ſaid that men are naturally more zealous in the propagation of wrong notions, than in the maintenance of ſuch as are right.

It is much more by conſiderations of this kind, than by any high opinion which we entertain of the talents diſplayed in the Chriſtian Obſerver, that we have been induced to take notice of an article in that fanatical publication for Auguſt laſt. The article profeſſes to be a review of Dr. Gleig's Sermons; while, in truth, it is only a miſerable attempt to prevent their being read by the followers of the party; occaſioned, we doubt not, by a clear conviction that few diſcourſes are better calculated to open the eyes of theſe deluded enthuſiaſts. The Chriſtian Obſerver, it muſt be remembered, is one of thoſe engines which have been ſet to work with a view of co-operating in the grand project of perſuading the good people of the united kingdom that the tenets of J. Calvin are thoſe of ſcripture, and of the United Church. The engine, we think, indeed, a weak one; but, if its powers be ſmall, its operations are inceſſant. When the ſermons of this eminent divine came under our conſideration, we diſtinctly foreſaw, and expreſsly foretold, what reception they would meet with from ſuch publications as the Chriſtian Obſerver. "By Calviniſts," we ſaid, "by Methodiſts, miſſionaries, and enthuſiaſts of whatever denomination, the theological ſentiments of theſe diſcourſes will be ſtigmatized as heterodox in the higheſt degree. Mr. Overton, and his TRUE CHURCHMEN will, we doubt not, even repreſent him (Dr. Gleig) as an enemy to the doctrine of ſalvation by grace, through faith in the Redeemer. (Vol. xv. p. 231.) This was our prediction, which was ſoon fulfilled. The Chriſtian Obſerver, (and we thank him for the favour,) was kindly reſolved, it ſeems, that, whatever might be our other ſins, we ſhould not continue above a month, at moſt, under the imputation of being "lying prophets."

This Reviewer begins by allowing Dr. Gleig the praiſe of being "a zealous ſupporter of the cauſe of civil ſubordination and ſocial order, and a hearty well-wiſher to the honour and welfare of his country." It is alſo allowed that the Doctor "appears to be earneſt in inculcating what he eſteems to be ſound doctrine, and in combating what he imagines to be falſe and injurious;" and that "he expreſſes a concern for the intereſts of morality which it is impoſſible not to approve." Theſe, ſurely, are no mean recommendations of any man's ſermons. But the merit of ſuch qualities is totally annihilated in the enormity of an offence, which is ſtated as follows, by our orthodox Reviewer. "Our readers, however, will be prepared to expect that the doctrinal errors of this work will prove neither few nor unimportant, when they are told that the author is a ſtrenuous oppoſer of two fundamental doctrines of the goſpel and the Church of England—ORIGINAL or BIRTH-SIN, and JUSTIFICATON BY FAITH ONLY."

The charge that a divine is "a ſtrenuous oppoſer of the fundamental doctrines of the goſpel and of the Church of England," is, indeed, a ſe-

rious

rious one; and no divine convicted of such a charge shall ever be defended or patronized by us. But we have learned, as, we hope, our readers have, to distinguish, what such writers as this Reviewer perpetually confound, and wish others to confound, the doctrines of Calvin and of his disciples, from those of the gospel and of the Church of England. Of the former doctrines we believe that Dr. Gleig is a strenuous opposer; but that he is an opposer of the latter doctrines this writer has, at least, produced no evidence: and we are not, we own, much accustomed to repose implicit faith on the simple *ipse dixit* of a Calvinistic controversialist.

With regard to the doctrine of original sin, which involves the much disputed question, πόθεν το κακον? the most difficult, undoubtedly, which ever engaged the attention of the human mind, we have no means of knowing whether Dr. Gleig holds any, or what, *particular* opinions. Our judgment of his notions is formed from his printed volume alone; and from that we defy the Christian Observer to point out a passage, which, taken in fair connection and construction, contradicts the gospel or the Church of England. The Christian Observer, it is true, accuses us of having bestowed on his discourses "a mass of adulation." Bnt we have carefully and repeatedly perused these discourses. We have, probably, studied the subjects of which they treat as deeply as they have been studied by any contributor to the Christian Observer. On a first perusal we thought these discourses most masterly, sound, and orthodox compositions. A farther acquaintance with them has confirmed our opinion; and, of course, we are not disposed to retract an atom of our praise. But we must pay some attention to the cavils of this Reviewer.

It is necessary to observe that the *Calvinistic* doctrine of original sin is, like every other fundamental doctrine of the system, a disgusting compound of nonsense and blasphemy. Its first and most essential ingredient is the decree of God, fore-ordaining the fall, and all its consequences. Another is the imputation of Adam's sin, in such a manner that all his descendants are properly, formally, and personally, sinners: to which imputation corresponds the imputation of the Redeemer's righteousness, by which some persons called the elect become properly, formally, and personally, righteous. A third is that all the rest of mankind are not only naturally, but necessarily (because by the immutable decree of God,) rendered absolutely incapable of ever emerging from that state of sin, and of eternal damnation, into which they were plunged by Adam's transgression. From this state, indeed, the elect themselves, notwithstanding their being perfectly righteous by the righteousness of Christ, can be rescued only by the overpowering force of invincible grace. Many other collateral notions might be mentioned; but we need not pursue the inquiry farther. No Calvinist can pretend to deny that these are essential ingredients in his system. The first indeed has been lately disclaimed, though without success, by the champion of "The True Churchmen." But we can do without it; and we simply ask if the second and third do not make God the author of sin, and lay men, all men but the elect, under an insuperable *necessity* of sinning? Let us hear, however, the Christian Observer. "It is observable," he says, "of Dr. Gleig, and it has been observed of many others, (not much indeed to the credit of their generosity,) that when about to hunt down some obnoxious opinion, they before hand incumber it with a superadded load of extraneous absurdity, in order to ensure the success of their pursuit. Thus, in the volume before

us, the doctrine of original ſin is repreſented as making God the author of ſin, and furniſhing ſinners with an apology for their iniquities; and it is from this *ſuppoſed* tendency of the doctrine that almoſt all Dr. Gleig's arguments againſt it are derived."

Is this tendency, then, of the foregoing notions only *ſuppoſed?* So, at leaſt, our critic *ſeems* to ſay, with the common good faith of theſe pious true Churchmen. But if the *notions* are taught, the tendency is *real*; and we maintain that they are not only taught, but, to the high diſhonour of God and of religion, moſt vehemently inculcated, in their utmoſt latitude, as the very marrow of the goſpel of Chriſt. Of *ſuch* a theory of original ſin, every man of underſtanding, ſenſe, and benevolence, muſt, of courſe, declare his utter abhorrence; and this theory alone has Dr. Gleig attacked. The Reviewer, however, has quoted, on this ſubject, from Dr. Gleig's third ſermon, a ſhort extract which, as being the only foundation of his charge, we judge it requiſite to lay before our readers.

The Doctor, towards the beginning of the ſermon, obſerves that angels as well as men have ſinned; but that to ſay that either were impelled to ſin by the depravity of their nature, is a blaſphemous reflection on him who created all things: that the human powers are indeed leſs perfect than the angelic powers, and that, therefore, leſs will be required of men than of angels; but that if either men or angels tranſgreſs the law under which they are reſpectively placed, the tranſgreſſion cannot proceed from conſtraint or neceſſity of nature, but from their own criminal inattention, or deliberate perverſeneſs. After ſome intermediate obſervations occurs the obnoxious paſſage quoted by our critic, of which the tenor is as follows:

"But do we not derive, from our firſt parents, a conſtitution, both of body and mind, much leſs perfect than that which they derived from the immediate hand of their Omnipotent Creator? And is there not in every deſcendant of Adam, an innate and inſuperable propenſity to ſin?"

"To theſe queſtions, which have been often put, very different anſwers have been given, which have excited violent diſſenſions in the Church of Chriſt; and yet it is not eaſy to conceive queſtions of leſs importance either to the faith or to the practice of a Chriſtian."

"We derive nothing from our firſt parents, more than the oak derives from the acorn, but by the will of God holy and good; and if our natural powers be indeed leſs perfect than theirs were, either theſe powers are rendered equal by divine grace, or we have the aſſurance of our Saviour that leſs will be required of us than would have been required of them, had they continued in their ſtate of perfection."

This is the dangerous and fatal paſſage which, in regard to the doctrine of original ſin, is to fix on Dr. Gleig the brand of hereſy. But how is the hereſy of this paſſage proved? Why, nothing is ſo eaſy: as, for inſtance, thus: 1. "The foregoing extract ſpeaks pretty *plainly* for itſelf." 2. "Dr. Gleig's expreſſions are *not very luminous*. There is, however, light enough to ſhew the heterodoxy of his ſentiments." Theſe are the words, the *ipſiſſima verba*, of the Chriſtian Obſerver, relating not to *different* paſſages, but to *the ſame identical* paſſage, of Dr. Gleig's ſermons. And who but muſt admire his logical deduction, the conſiſtency of his conceptions, and the cogency of his argument!

But,

But, if our critic cannot reaſon, he can, at leaſt, inſinuate and miſrepreſent. He requeſts the particular notice of his readers to Dr. Gleig's aſſertion that "*we derive nothing from our firſt parents, more than the oak derives from the acorn, but by the will of God holy and good.*" And what is the import of this requeſt? Why, his readers muſt believe, on his bare inſinuation, that the aſſertion contains ſome damnable hereſy, though he cannot tell what; for this writer, it ſeems, can wind a hereſy at the diſtance of fifty thouſand miles, though he cannot ſmell it juſt under his noſe. But the Chriſtian Obſerver will not *dare* to deny the truth of Dr. Gleig's propoſition, either in whole or in part. The critic next affirms that Dr. Gleig "makes it a matter of *queſtion*, whether *our natural powers be, indeed, leſs perfect than thoſe of our firſt parents.*" Whether this affirmation be the effect of ignorance or of deſign, we leave our readers to judge; but a groſſer miſrepreſentation we have never ſeen; and a groſſer falſehood, in point of fact, it is impoſſible to advance. Dr. Gleig, as will be obvious to every one, does NOT make the ſubject a matter of queſtion; for he does not enter into the queſtion at all. He expreſsly ſays that "it is not eaſy to conceive a queſtion of leſs importance," and that "it is of no conſequence whatever whether we be more or leſs perfect than Adam was." But, continues our critic, Dr. Gleig "leaves it *undetermined*, whether *our powers are rendered equal to theirs by divine grace*, or *leſs will be required of us, than would have been required of them, had they continued in their ſtate of perfection.*" Now why any man ſhould incur the diſpleaſure of the Chriſtian Obſerver for not determining a point, of which the determination was altogether indifferent to his argument, ſome, perhaps, may be at a loſs to comprehend. But to thoſe who know theſe Calviniſts thoroughly, the reaſon, we apprehend, can be no ſecret.

The avowed object of Dr. Gleig's third ſermon is to ſhew that all Chriſtians are poſſeſſed of power to perform their duty; and this, he contends, is equally the caſe whatever notions we entertain of the corruption of human nature. If our natural powers were degraded by the fall, (and Dr. Gleig does not even inſinuate the contrary,) they are reſtored by grace, ſo that now we are not, (to ſay the leaſt,) in a *worſe* ſituation than Adam was. To *every* Chriſtian, according to Dr. Gleig, a degree of grace is afforded ſufficient, provided only that he will cordially co-operate with it, to enable him to work out his own ſalvation; *hinc illæ lachrymæ*. A Calviniſt admits neither the co-operation, nor the univerſality, of ſaving grace. In his ſcheme, ſuch grace is confined to the elect, in whom, without any concurrence of theirs, it operates by an irreſiſtible, and, properly ſpeaking, a mechanical impulſe. A Calviniſt, therefore, can never allow that every man may perform his duty; and the real hereſy of Dr. Gleig conſiſts, not at all in denying original ſin, concerning which he does not even hint his opinion, but in aſſerting the doctrine of UNIVERSAL REDEMPTION, and that every Chriſtian may be ſaved if he will. The Chriſtian Obſerver, however, it is probable, imagined it rather a matter of prudence to diſſemble his own diſbelief of this doctrine. But, at all events, it will hardly be thought a great proof of his wiſdom to have brought, againſt Dr. Gleig, a charge of hereſy, in a point which the Doctor repeatedly declares that he has no occaſion whatever to diſcuſs.

Our critic, however, has a notable quibble on the word *inſuperable*. "Although," he ſays, "it be true that the queſtion has often been put whether

whether there be not an *innate* propenſity to ſin in every deſcendant of Adam, it has *not* been much queſtioned whether this propenſity be an *inſuperable* one. Moſt people, indeed all whom we have heard or read of, believe it to be *ſuperable*; and it is the great buſineſs of religion, and the immediate and declared purpoſe of divine grace, to *overcome* this *innate propenſity* in man." What? in all mankind without exception? Why no. But in all *Chriſtians* then? The Chriſtian Obſerver will not ſay ſo. It is, according to his principles, the purpoſe of grace to overcome this propenſity in the *elect alone*. In all others, therefore, denominate them reprobates, or what you will, the *innate* propenſity remains *inſuperable*.

Of the great Proteſtant doctrine (as it has been called) of *juſtification by faith only*, it is plain that this Reviewer does not comprehend even the very firſt elemental principles. His petulance, however, is equal to his ignorance; for the following is the ſtile in which our Ariſtarchus decides on the merits of Dr. Gleig, in ſo far as the ſubject of this doctrine is concerned. "On a topic which has been ſo profuſely diſcuſſed, it would have been unreaſonable to expect any thing new; but Dr Gleig's obſervations are not only *not novel*, but they tend to re-involve the ſubject in *difficulties from which it has before been extricated*. A want of perſpicuity and preciſion both in his ideas and his language appears equally in his ſtatement of the doctrine which he oppoſes, and in his explication of the doctrine which he maintains. *He is not always conſiſtent with himſelf; and ſome paſſages appear to contradict each other.*"

What the difficulties are in which Dr. Gleig has *re-involved* the doctrine of juſtification by faith, it were ſurely unreaſonable to aſk a critic who appears to ſuppoſe that he is enlightening his readers when he is only ſtringing together identical propoſitions, and who ſeems not even to underſtand the meaning of a very familiar term. It is needleſs to dwell on the wiſe and ſagacious remark that "in a writer who is not always conſiſtent with himſelf ſome paſſages will appear to contradict each other," becauſe every perſon muſt inſtantly perceive its importance. But we muſt requeſt it to be attended to that our Reviewer has declared from the chair of criticiſm, that, on the ſubject of juſtification by faith, Dr. Gleig's obſervations are NOT NOVEL. In proof of the juſtneſs of this critical deciſion, we ſhall now produce, from the following page of our Reviewer's ſtrictures, two ſhort quotations, the one relating to a particular paſſage, the other relating, it would ſeem, to the volume in general.

"There is one paſſage in the ſermon on juſtification, to which, whatever other recommendation it may want, we muſt unreſervedly allow the merit of ABSOLUTE ORIGINALITY."

"Dr. Gleig tells us (p. 363.) of his having heard a man 'criticiſing ſyſtems of theology in a ſhop-door, in the hearing of the multitude on the ſtreet.' If Dr. Gleig's ſyſtem of theology were among the number of thoſe which the man in the ſhop-door criticiſed, we cannot wonder that the multitude in the ſtreet ſhould ſtop to hear his diſquiſitions; for THINGS NEW AND STRANGE have great attractions for the vulgar."

UTRUM HORUM MAVIS ACCIPE. "HE IS NOT ALWAYS CONSISTENT WITH HIMSELF; AND SOME PASSAGES APPEAR TO CONTRADICT EACH OTHER. (Chriſt. Obſerv.)

The firſt paſſage from Dr. Gleig on this ſubject which falls under the laſh of our critic, is as follows: "But though faith in Chriſt be abſolutely neceſſary to the juſtification of a Chriſtian, it will not alone juſtify him.

him. Though it is undoubtedly his *firſt* duty, it is not the *whole* of his duty; for the commandment of God is, that we ſhould not only believe on the name of his ſon Jeſus Chriſt, but alſo love one another as he gave us commandment." On this the critic's chief obſervation is: "The reader will not overlook the weakneſs of the reaſoning employed in this paſſage; the ſum of which is, that faith alone *will not juſtify the Chriſtian*, becauſe faith *is not the whole of his duty*." The weakneſs of the reaſoning, we apprehend, will be obvious to none except thoſe whoſe intellects, and knowledge of divinity, are nearly on a level with this Reviewer's; who, if he meant to affirm that the ſimple virtue or grace of faith is the only condition required on our part to entitle us to the benefits of the Chriſtian covenant (for that is the real import of being juſtified) may be ſtiled *hæreticorum facile princeps*. This licentious notion, though adopted by his party, is as oppoſite to the doctrine of ſcripture and of the Church of England as light is to darkneſs. "But the main object of attention," continues our Reviewer, "and that to which we more particularly call the conſideration of the reader, is Dr. Gleig's aſſertion that faith alone will not juſtify us. We have heretofore read in a book, whoſe authority Dr. Gleig will not impeach, that 'we are juſtified by faith only."

To this notable argument, which our Reviewer, no doubt, ſeems unanſwerable, Dr. Gleig, we think, has only to reply that *he* has heretofore read in a book whoſe authority the Chriſtian Obſerver will not impeach, the following words: "What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man ſay he hath faith, and have not works? Can faith *ſave* him? ... Ye ſee then how that *by works* a man is juſtified, and *not by faith only*." But ſuch a reply, though the Chriſtian Obſerver is entitled to no other, would contribute nothing to the elucidation of the ſubject. The Chriſtian Obſerver knows, or ought to know, that concerning the *authority* of both the foregoing aſſertions there is, among divines of the Church of England no diſpute, and that the only queſtion is concerning their *meaning*. Had he, therefore, intended to ſay any thing to the purpoſe, he would have told his readers in what ſenſe *both are true, and conſiſtent with one another*. On this ſubject we would adviſe him to ſtudy Biſhop Bull's *Harmonia Apoſtolica*, with its ſeveral defences. In the mean time we recommend to his notice the opinion of another eminent divine, which the limits of our article will permit us to copy. This author, ſpeaking of the reaſoning of St. Paul on the ſubject of juſtification by faith, ſays, "The general form of the argument is this; men are ſinners; therefore cannot be accounted juſt, without an act of *mercy* in the Judge of the world." He then proceeds thus:

"Is not our doctrine contrary to that of St. James? who ſays, 'can faith ſave him?' No; the moſt that can be allowed is, that the reaſoning of James is intended for different *circumſtances* from that of Paul; or that it is intended to ſupply what common ſenſe would always ſupply, if no evaſion of duty was in view. But I doubt whether even ſo great a difference as that need be allowed between theſe ſacred writers. Let us ſuppoſe them to confer.—*Paul*. We are juſtified by faith.---*James*. Will he be juſtified who does no good works?---*Paul*. No; I did not ſay that; I have ſaid, the wicked will be *puniſhed*.---*James*. You did not mention *works* with faith?---*Paul*. No; but I plainly meant to addreſs myſelf to Jews and Heathens, and to declare to them that, when they *had performed* what they called good works, their eternal ſalvation muſt ſtill depend

upon

upon the divine *mercy:* to thoſe who profeſs to *neglect* good works I have ſaid *nothing.---James.* Then we agree; or, at leaſt, we do not diſagree. You ſay, ſuch works as Jews and Heathens have been found to perform, cannot ſave them: I ſay, *nothing* will ſave them if they do not ſtrive to live well." (Hey's Lectures, Vol. III. p. 277.)

We muſt however do our Reviewer juſtice: "We are aware," he ſays, "that to contraſt aſſertions does not elucidate doctrines;" and he is deſirous to furniſh Dr. Gleig with "a brief, comprehenſive, and perſpicuous ſtatement" of the doctrine. "When orthodox Chriſtians aſſert the ancient doctrine of juſtification by faith alone, they mean, as an old writer well expreſſes it, *juſtificatio per fidem ſolam, ſed non per fidem ſolitariam*, that is, as the ſame writer well tranſlates it, *juſtification by faith alone, but not by that faith which is alone.*" We may here, with great propriety, adopt the words of Biſhop Bull on a ſimilar occaſion: "Audio quidem optimi Patris verba; ſed de ſenſu ejus adhuc quæritur." But the ſenſe in which the original reformers maintained that "men are juſtified by faith only," or, as our Homily on Salvation ſometimes expreſſes it, "by only faith," we ſhall give in the words of this great divine; who has not only aſſerted, but proved, it to be the ſenſe of all, or, at leaſt, of the moſt reſpectable reformed confeſſions. Of theſe he ſays:

"Quippe etiamſi illæ quoque doceant, *ex fide ſolâ ſine operibus hominem juſtificari*; effatum tamen illud eo ſenſu explicant, quem nos pronis ulnis amplexamur. Scil. diſertis verbis monent confeſſionum authores, ſententiam iſtam *figurate accipiendam eſſe*, ita ut in *fidei* nomine *gratia*, quæ ei ex adverſo reſpondet, intelligatur, atque idem ſit *ſolâ fide juſtificari* quod *ſolâ gratiâ, non ex operum merito, juſtificari*: ac, propriè loquendo, fidem cæteraſque virtutes bonaque opera ad juſtificationem æque valere atque eſſe neceſſaria: nec quicquam majus fidei in iſto negotio tribuendum, quam cæteris virtutibus: adeoque ſe, quatenus a juſtificatione bona opera excludunt, eatenus et fidem ipſam rejicere. . . . Quicquid igitur ſeu caliginis, ſive erroris, accreverit huic luculentiſſimæ de juſtificatione hominis doctrinâ, quatenus ea a Proteſtantibus hodie docetur; illud fere totum privatorum quorundam theologorum hallucinationibus, qui purioris ac primitivæ (ſi ita loqui fas ſit) reformationis ſententiam perperam acceperunt, imputandum eſt." (Harm. Apoſtol. Diſſert. I. Cap. vi. Sect. 1.

The notion which is meant to be inculcated by the Chriſtian Obſerver, namely, that faith is the *only condition* of juſtification, is in truth one of the moſt pernicious errors which have ever been broached in the Chriſtian Church, and the foundation of the moſt abominable antinomianiſm, as may be ſeen in Criſpe and many others. It is the error, however, of private divines, and not of the Church of England. By the expreſſion, "we are juſtified by faith only," our original reformers meant the ſame as by "we are juſtified *freely, without works:*" and by this latter expreſſion they did not underſtand that good works are *no condition* of our juſtification, but only that they are not to be accounted *the meritorious cauſe* of it. The Chriſtian Obſerver may ſee this proved, to a demonſtration, by Biſhop Bull, Har. Apoſt. Diſſ. II. Cap. xviii. Sect. 6, and confirmed, Apol. pro Harm. Sect. 5. But, in reality, to place the ſentiments of the Church of England, on this ſubject, beyond the limits of controverſy, nothing more is requiſite than a ſingle ſentence of the Homily on Salvation, to which we are expreſsly referred by the XIth Article, and

which therefore, by all parties who acknowledge its authority, muſt be finally admitted to decide the diſpute. The ſentence is liable to no miſconſtruction; and it ſtates itſelf to be expreſsly intended for a full and explicit explanation of the doctrine. "This ſaying, that we be juſtified by faith only, freely, and without works, is ſpoken for *to take away clearly all* MERIT *of our works*, as *being unable* TO DESERVE *our juſtification at God's hands*, and thereby moſt plainly to expreſs the weakneſs of man, and the goodneſs of God; the great infirmity of ourſelves, and the might and power of God; the *imperfection* of our own works, and the moſt abundant *grace* of our Saviour Chriſt; AND THEREFORE WHOLLY TO ASCRIBE THE MERIT AND DESERVING OF OUR JUSTIFICATION UNTO CHRIST ONLY, AND HIS MOST PRECIOUS BLOOD-SHEDDING. (Hom. Ed. Oxon. 1802. p. 21.) Of the ſenſe in which the Church of England underſtands the expreſſion, "we are juſtified by faith only," nothing more need or can be ſaid.

Having thus conſidered the doctrine in general, we might ſafely paſs by our critic's particular objections to Dr. Gleig's view of it. But we wiſh to hold, as much as poſſible, the balance even between both parties: we muſt, therefore, beg the attention of our readers to the paſſage to which the critic allows the merit of abſolute originality.

"By the grace of the ſecond covenant," ſays Dr. Gleig, "all mankind are rendered immortal in conſequence of the death and reſurrection of Chriſt, who is the lamb ſlain, in the divine decree, from the foundation of the world; but to obtain immortal *happineſs*, they muſt obſerve the conditions of the covenant, which are faith in Chriſt, and repentance from dead works. *The former condition, faith, relates chiefly to our future exiſtence; the latter to our future happineſs.*" The ſentence in italics, our critic informs us, preſents an opinion which he never met with before. We can eaſily believe him; and the concluſion which we draw from the information is that his reading is, as we ſuſpected, very confined. The critic however finds an abſurdity in this paragraph, and aſks with an air of ſelf-importance, "How can faith be, in any ſenſe, a *condition* of our future exiſtence, if *all mankind* (thoſe who have *not* faith, as well as thoſe who have) be rendered *immortal* by the grace of the ſecond covenant?" But the critic firſt *makes* the abſurdity, and then finds it. Dr. Gleig expreſsly ſays that faith and repentance are *conditions of the covenant*. But he does *not* ſay, as the Reviewer would compel him to do, that faith is the *condition of our future exiſtence*. He ſays, indeed, that faith *relates to our future exiſtence*; and it appears that our critic's idea of *relation* is as confined as his reading: for he cannot conceive two things related, except the one be a condition of the other. Dr. Gleig, however, in ſpite of his Reviewer, is, in this place, both accurate in language, and orthodox in ſentiment. If man be intended to live for ever, his claim muſt be in conſequence of *a covenant of grace*; for no created being can poſſibly have ſuch a claim by nature. *Immortal* life was, accordingly, at firſt ſuſpended on Adam's abſtaining from the forbidden fruit, and forfeited by his eating it. "In the day that thou eateſt thereof thou ſhalt ſurely," or utterly, "die." Had this threat been put in immediate execution, there had been an utter end of the human race. Immortal life is reſtored to all mankind through Chriſt; and this every Chriſtian is bound to believe. But beſide immortal *life*, our Redeemer has alſo purchaſed for us, on certain conditions, immortal *happineſs*. In order, however, that Chriſtians may finally

be

be partakers of this laſt, it is not enough that they believe the Redeemer to be the author of both; they muſt likewiſe repent from dead works; or, in other words, they muſt live in a courſe of Chriſtian obedience.

In Dr. Gleig's fifth diſcourſe this Reviewer finds, he ſays, "a query ſtated, which is ſo eaſily anſwered, that it would be an act of moſt parſimonious unkindneſs to withhold a reply." The query is this: "But if it be true that the nature of man is ſo corrupted that 'the good which he would, he doth not; and the evil which he would not, that he doth'---does it not follow that we are laid under the neceſſity of ſinning?" The critic anſwers, "No. It is true at leaſt of ſome man; for *St. Paul expreſsly aſſerts it.* But it does *not* follow from hence that any man is laid under a *neceſſity of ſinning.*" The Reviewer is certainly very kind in anſwering the queſtion; but if he had read only *ſeven* lines more, he might have diſcovered that his kindneſs was entirely a work of ſupererogation. For at no greater diſtance Dr. Gleig thus expreſſes himſelf: "Such doctrines as this have indeed been inferred from the words of my text, and from ſimilar paſſages of holy ſcripture; but I need hardly obſerve to you, that in the reaſoning which attempts to eſtabliſh them, the concluſion is directly contrary to the premiſes." He then goes on to argue *againſt* this concluſion, which, he contends, is not only *falſe* but *impious.* The Reviewer, however, very evidently wiſhed his readers to believe that Dr. Gleig holds the concluſion to be *true,* and, of courſe, diſbelieves the aſſertion of St. Paul. His conduct will admit of no other conſtruction, ſo that here again we have a pregnant inſtance of the candid good faith of theſe ſainted "True Churchmen."

This Reviewer complains that, "in many writers, ſome of the peculiar and diſtinguiſhing doctrines of the Goſpel are mentioned, not as prime ſubjects of diſcuſſion and attention, not as fundamental truths upon which all others reſt, but as matters of caſual and ſupplementary *acknowledgment*; matters which it would not be decent to overlook altogether, but which it is not neceſſary to dwell upon." In illuſtration of this remark he alleges Dr. Gleig's diſcourſe on Coloſſ. i. 12. "In diſcourſing on this text," he ſays, "Dr. Gleig has ſo ſucceſsfully avoided touching on the moſt prominent truth contained in it, that, independently of the text itſelf, there is not one ſyllable, from the beginning to the end of it, which refers to our being *made meet* for the inheritance of the ſaints *by the* FATHER."

It is, indeed, a circumſtance much to be lamented that the ſound divine who would fulfil his duty, ſhould be obliged to employ ſo much of his time in expoſing error: for that is, in part, the true account of the caſe. But errors, at leaſt ſuch as are groſsly pernicious, and ſubverſive of the foundations of our faith, when once they have been adopted, muſt be expoſed, before truth can be ſucceſsfully recommended. Such writers as the Chriſtian Obſerver and his friends are perpetually labouring, both with tongue and pen, to overwhelm with impiety, abſurdity, and nonſenſe, the pure and genuine doctrines of the Goſpel. Can they reaſonably complain of thoſe who, perſuaded as they are that ſuch is the caſe, endeavour to counteract them? Beſides, theſe enthuſiaſts will allow that none preach "the peculiar and diſtinguiſhing doctrines of the Goſpel," who are not as wild and extravagant as themſelves. Our Reviewer, for example, we are well perſuaded, were he to preach on Co-

loſſ. i. 12. would ſpend the greater part of his time in explaining to his audience that, by "our being made meet by the Father," is meant that God is the ſole operator in the whole buſineſs of man's ſalvation; that man can do nothing at all for himſelf, but that every thing is carried on by the invincible influence of Sovereign grace. He might ſtate that this moſt comfortable doctrine is the conſequence of election, and the ground of abſolute aſſurance of ſalvation. He might tell them that, as they are *able* to do nothing, ſo, in real truth, they have nothing to do but to *turn* or *roll themſelves over on Chriſt*, who is bound to ſuffer none of them to fall away from grace. All this the Reviewer, we doubt not, would call, as it has frequently, too frequently, been called before, preaching "the peculiar and diſtinguiſhing doctrines of the Goſpel. But, thank God, *we* have not ſo learned Chriſt; and hence we enjoy, what we highly eſteem, the honour of ſharing, with ſuch divines as Dr. Gleig, in the cenſures of the Chriſtian Obſerver.

This conſequential critic calls Dr. Gleig to taſk for talking of our "virtuous brother for whom Chriſt died," and for ſuppoſing that a man may live "negatively innocent." With regard to the former expreſſion he obſerves that "according to the repreſentations of the word of God, Chriſt died not for the *virtuous*, but for *ſinners*---for the *ungodly*." This obſervation would have greatly ſurpriſed us, if any thing could ſurpriſe us from the Chriſtian Obſerver. What? does the ſcripture ſay that Chriſt died not for the virtuous? We conceived it to ſay that he died for all men. We have read, as well as the Chriſtian Obſerver, the expreſſions of St. Paul: "For when we were yet without ſtrength, in due time Chriſt died for the ungodly," and "God commenceth his love towards us, in that while we were yet ſinners Chriſt died for us." But we never imagined theſe expreſſions to imply that thoſe for whom Chriſt died muſt *continue ſinners*. Yet this is what the Chriſtian Obſerver muſt mean, if his criticiſm be at all to the purpoſe. Thus we ſee what a precious ſyſtem of divinity the Chriſtian Obſerver extracts from the ſcriptures. We were prepared to find this publication maintaining that Our Saviour died for the *elect alone*: but, that when we have reaſon to believe a man *virtuous*, we muſt exclude him from thoſe for whom Chriſt died, is an aſſertion which certainly exceeded our expectations. We formerly hinted our ſuſpicions of the antinomianiſm of the Chriſtian Obſerver (Vol. XV. p. 75); but now we ſee him openly and boldly avowing it: for this is the *ipſiſſima antinomorum fæx et hæreſis peſtilentiſſima*. Of this doctrine the unequivocal language is, "Let us do evil that good may come; let us continue in ſin that grace may abound."

With regard to the ſecond of the above expreſſions, the Reviewer "would aſk," he ſays, "whether Dr. Gleig believes that any men do live *negatively innocent*, and without *poſitive ſin*?" Some perſons, we know, will aſk very fooliſh queſtions, with as grave an air as if they were very wiſe ones; and this, we preſume, is, at preſent, the caſe of the Chriſtian Obſerver. Does the Chriſtian Obſerver, then, believe that all men are ſinners in an equal degree? Were we not afraid that he would evade our queſtion by a miſerable quibble on the word *men*, we would aſk him what *poſitive ſin* he aſcribes to an infant two days, or even two months old? But, to cut the matter ſhort, and to preclude all wrangling, we ſimply aſk him whether the man who has committed only robbery be not *negatively innocent* compared with him who has been guilty both of robbery and

of

of murder? So eaſy is it to diſcern the difference between *poſitive ſin* and *negative innocence*. Of the ſins from which a man abſtains he is *negatively innocent*; of thoſe which he commits he is *poſitively guilty*; ſo that the ſame man may be negatively innocent in one reſpect, who, in another reſpect, is a poſitive ſinner.

But accurate preciſion and diſcrimination of thought ſeem none of the talents of this doughty Reviewer. He would be a philoſopher, indeed, as well as a divine; and we ſhall here exhibit a ſpecimen of his philoſophy, which can hardly, we think, fail to convince our readers with what deep attention and ſingular ſucceſs he has ſtudied the principles of the human mind. Dr. Gleig, in his ſermon on 1 John iv. 20, ſtates it as the Apoſtle's doctrine, "that human benevolence is progreſſive; that it embraces firſt our relations, our friends, and our neighbours; that it gradually extends to the ſociety to which we belong; then comprehends our country; then the whole human race; and at laſt ſtretches itſelf towards the great and beneficent Author of Nature." On this paſſage the Reviewer writes as follows: "It is poſſible that Dr. Gleig can ſuppoſe that God is the *laſt* object that attracts the exerciſe of that benevolence which St. John inculcates? Does he imagine that our love muſt be laterally expanded to all the inhabitants of the earth, before it begins to aſcend to the God of heaven? We have been accuſtomed to hold an opinion on this ſubject *not only different*, *but oppoſite* to that contained in the above cited paſſage."

If we underſtand the Reviewer aright, it is an eſſential part of his theory of human nature that a child loves God before he loves his nurſe. We were wondering to what particular ſect of philoſophers this writer belonged; and we found it impoſſible to ſatisfy ourſelves, till we recollected that the late Lord Kames, who accounted for almoſt every phenomenon in the mental conſtitution of man by ſome *innate internal ſenſe*, enumerates, among the original principles of human nature, a SENSE OF DEITY. We, therefore, preſume that our ingenious Reviewer muſt be a follower of that eminent philoſopher; and to his theory of the progreſs of the benevolent affections we have, we confeſs, but one trifling objection, which is that IT IS IN DIRECT CONTRADICTION TO UNIVERSAL EXPERIENCE AND FACT. When the affection of love, after being exerciſed on inferior objects, has aſcended to the great Creator of the Univerſe, it will certainly be reflected from him, and embrace with warmer feelings of benevolence, the human race, as his creatures and our brethren. But that God is the *primary* object of our love, though our ſeemingly ſeraphic Reviewer affects to think ſo, is the mere chimera of a viſionary brain; and the reaſoning of St. John is plainly grounded on the ſuppoſition that it is utterly impoſſible.

But we muſt draw to a concluſion; for, to adopt the language of the Chriſtian Obſerver, "We are impatient to abridge the taſk of detecting the errors of the work before us;" we ſhall, therefore, paſs by the Reviewer's remarks on what he calls the "very reprehenſible practice of blending together two or more fragments of texts, and printing them as if they were originally connected;" becauſe the practice, as every one muſt perceive, is reprehenſible, or not, juſt as it is conducted, or not, with ſound judgment and diſcretion. But one ſhort paſſage more we muſt quote from the volumes of Dr. Gleig, becauſe the Chriſtian Obſerver ſolemnly pronounces it deſerving of "a very ſerious cenſure." The

paſſage is this: "Many a man, who in his heart reveres, perhaps as he ought to do, the God of his fathers, and hopes for ſalvation only through the croſs of Chriſt, can yet ſmile at the jeſt of the impious ſcoffer, and ſuffer, at his own table, his Creator and Redeemer to be mentioned in terms which, if applied to himſelf or his friend, he would reſent with indignation." Conſidering the diſpoſitions of this Reviewer, and his rancorous animoſity againſt Dr. Gleig, our readers, perhaps, may regard it as a very powerful recommendation of the volume of this able divine, that his critic is obliged to have recourſe to ſuch a paſſage as a vehicle through which to diſcharge his venom. He aſks if ſuch a man as Dr. Gleig deſcribes really "*reveres*, and even *perhaps as he ought to do*, the God of his fathers?" But here he gives another proof of the candour of Calviniſtic Methodiſts. He omits the emphatic words "in his heart," in which conſiſts the whole ſtreſs of the Doctor's reproof; as implying the abſurd and criminal inconſiſtency of ſuffering the fear or the reſpect of men to overpower the ſuggeſtions of our better principles. Perhaps, however, the Chriſtian Obſerver has been fortunate enough never to meet with a man whoſe principles were right while his conduct was faulty. If ſo, we congratulate him on his happy experience of human life. But *we*, alas! can bear no ſuch favourable teſtimony either of ourſelves, or of other men.

"Our readers," ſays the Reviewer, "will now have no difficulty in judging in what eſtimation we hold theſe ſermons." Notwithſtanding all this affectation of contempt, we more than ſuſpect that he holds theſe ſermons in higher eſtimation than he is willing to acknowledge; and that this ebullition of critical malevolence is owing more to a dread of their power than to a perſuaſion of their impotence. But we muſt now proceed to ſay a few words of ourſelves, whom this writer has attacked with a moſt virulent aſperity.

It was a matter of courſe that the Anti-Jacobin Reviewers ſhould be objects of peculiar diſlike and reſentment to the Chriſtian Obſerver; for we have never ceaſed, and, with God's aſſiſtance, we never ſhall, to oppoſe, with all the ſtrength which we poſſeſs, thoſe wild, unſcriptural, blaſphemous dogmas which it is the great aim of that publication to diſſeminate as the fundamental doctrines of the Church of England. But the Chriſtian Obſerver, on the preſent occaſion, has not, we apprehend, been remarkably happy in making choice of the ground for his attack. He obſerves, in general, that, as we formerly recommended Dr. Gleig to a biſhopric, it was to be expected that we ſhould praiſe his ſermons; but that none of his moſt impaſſioned admirers could have anticipated the "maſs of adulation" which we have beſtowed upon them; adulation, however, which might have been ſafely overlooked, if it did not "involve the ſanction of *unſound doctrines*;" that our review of theſe ſermons furniſhes new evidences of the heterodoxy of our religious ſentiments, and affords freſh inſtances of our inconſiſtency; and, in fine, "that the contrariety which marks many of our pieces, added to the teſtimony of ſome recent events, proves that we are compoſed of individuals without any common principle to inſure uniformity, even on the grand points of religion and morality."

To theſe accuſations our anſwer ſhall be brief. We cannot well conceive why our claiming a privilege, which ſeems to be the inherent birthright of human nature, namely, that of forming our own opinion of the merits

merits and demerits of our friends and acquaintance, ſhould have given offence to the Chriſtian Obſerver. But we ſeriouſly aſſure him that, if we had it in our power *effectually* to recommend to a biſhopric, he is the laſt perſon whom we ſhould think of conſulting with regard to the proper object of choice. Of the terms in which we ſpoke of Dr. Gleig's ſermons our readers, and the public in general, muſt judge; and we are happy to find that the character which we gave of them has met with the full approbation of thoſe whoſe approbation we are, on every occaſion, moſt ſolicitous to obtain. With regard to the orthodoxy or heterodoxy of our religious ſentiments, we moſt willingly ſubmit to be tried by the ſame judges. We ſhould bluſh, we muſt own, to be thought, for a moment, by any perſon of diſcernment and ſenſe, to have been bred in the ſame ſchool with the Chriſtian Obſerver; whoſe *ſound doctrines* conſiſt of the rankeſt Antinomianiſm, grafted on the impious tenets of Calvin; and whoſe *churchmanſhip* is proved by unceaſing endeavours to *unchurch* the nation.

What the Chriſtian Obſerver means by the "teſtimony of ſome recent events," we ſhall not give ourſelves the trouble to conjecture. The expreſſion was probably intended only to enhance in the eyes of thoſe who implicitly devour his poiſoned morſels, the ſuppoſed importance of the Chriſtian Obſerver, by inſinuating that he is intimately acquainted with the ſecrets of our corps, to which he is, however, an abſolute ſtranger. As to the "contrariety of ſentiment which marks our pieces," and our being "compoſed of individuals without any common principles to inſure uniformity;" the public, we imagine, will be rather diſpoſed to believe that theſe imputations are true when the Chriſtian Obſerver ſhall have *proved* their truth, than when he has ſimply *aſſerted* it. He *ſays*, indeed, that "*many* proofs might be adduced of our inconſiſtency;" but, in the article before us, he confines himſelf to *two*, relating to the two important doctrines which have formed the principal ſubject of our preſent diſcuſſion. Theſe proofs it is incumbent upon us to examine.

In our Number for October 1802, (Vol. XIII. p. 187, &c.) we praiſed, as it deſerved, a viſitation-ſermon by the Rev. E. Cooper. Of the topics handled in that maſterly ſermon one was the importance of the doctrine of juſtification by faith alone, which the preacher calls "a grand fundamental doctrine of the Goſpel." This doctrine, ſays the Chriſtian Obſerver, is reprobated by Dr. Gleig: ſo that the ſentiments of theſe two divines on this ſubject are, according to him, "diametrically oppoſite." "The caſe," ſays he, "admits of ſuch a very conciſe and categorical ſtatement, that we will give it. *Mr. Cooper* holds, that *a man is juſtified by faith alone*. Dr. Gleig holds, that *a man is* NOT *juſtified by faith alone*. The Anti-Jacobin Reviewers *agree with them* BOTH!!" He then favours us with a ſcrap of Latin poetry, the intention of which, if we rightly comprehend it, is to prove that the Anti-Jacobin Reviewers are *hermaphrodites*.

——"*forma duplex*, nec fœmina dici,
"Nec puer ut poſſint; neutrumque; et utrumque, videntur."

To the Chriſtian Obſerver's diſplay of his learning we can have no objection. We do not even grudge him the liberty, (ſince it pleaſes him) of making a little *merry* with ourſelves. We ſhall not, however, be greatly ſurprized, ſhould we hear that he has been "*ſmitten*," by his brother

Dr. Haweis, with a ſevere reprimand for being ſo profane as to quote ſuch "*heathen men.*"

But what opinion muſt our readers form of the *honeſty* of the Chriſtian Obſerver, when we inform them that on the ſubject of juſtification by faith, there is not between Dr. Gleig and Mr. Cooper even the ſhadow of a difference? Let us hear the manner in which the latter expreſſes himſelf. "Perhaps there is not one of the glorious truths of revelation, which is more frequently turned to a bad uſe, and made the inſtrument of greater evil, than this. Men of corrupt minds have raiſed on it the moſt monſtrous and abominable ſyſtems: not aſhamed publicly to teach that, ſince we are juſtified *by faith alone*, *good works* are no longer neceſſary to ſalvation: and thus not only weakening the obligations to morality and holineſs, but even making that, which is the glory of the Goſpel, the avowed foundation of profligacy and vice." Mr. Cooper then obſerves that this perverſion of the truth is no modern invention; "though," adds he, "perhaps in no time has this *Antinomian hereſy* been more openly, and, it is to be feared, more ſucceſsfully propagated, than in the preſent."

From theſe paſſages it appears that of juſtification by faith alone, as uniformly taught by the Chriſtian Obſerver and the ſect of True Churchmen, Mr. Cooper is no leſs a ſtrenuous oppoſer than Dr. Gleig or ourſelves. We ſhall now produce ſome paſſages to ſhew in what ſenſe the learned preacher underſtands this fundamental doctrine of the Goſpel. Becauſe the doctrine has been abuſed, ſhall we therefore, he aſks, abandon it? "By way of providing an antidote to the poiſon, are we to preach that good works make any part of the *grounds* on which we are accounted righteous before God, and thus extol our own unprofitable ſervices as *co-eſſential with the meritorious obedience of Chriſt himſelf?*" No. "Let us contend, as earneſtly as our opponents can do, that *the merits of Chriſt are the only grounds of the ſinner's acceptance with God.*" But, "while we contend, with even Antinomian zeal, that 'by *grace* we are ſaved through faith;' that we 'are juſtified *freely by his grace*, through the redemption that is in Chriſt Jeſus;' at the ſame time let us maintain, with Apoſtolic energy, that 'without holineſs no man ſhall ſee the Lord;' that as *the merits of Chriſt alone* conſtitute our *title* to eternal glory, ſo in purity of heart alone conſiſts our 'meetneſs for partaking of the inheritance of the ſaints in light."

Our readers may now, perhaps, be diſpoſed to admire the impudence of the Chriſtian Obſerver in laying claim to the Rev. E. Cooper as the advocate of his own Antinomian principles. On the ſubject of juſtification by faith, Mr. Cooper's notions are preciſely the ſame with thoſe of Biſhop Bull, with thoſe of Dr. Hey, with thoſe of Dr. Gleig, with thoſe of the Anti-Jacobin Reviewers, and, finally, with thoſe of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND, as explicitly declared in her incomparable Homily "Of the ſalvation of mankind by only Chriſt our Saviour." In the "very conciſe and categorical ſtatement" on this point by the Chriſtian Obſerver, there is, therefore, a very conſiderable miſtake, which we ſhall beg leave to correct. The caſe, when properly ſtated, ſtands thus: "With regard to the doctrine of juſtification by faith only, Mr. Cooper and Dr. Gleig entirely agree; and the Anti-Jacobin Reviewers *agree with them* BOTH."

The Chriſtian Obſerver's ſecond proof of our inconſiſtency is derived from

from our calling on the Rev. E. Pearſon to explain a paſſage in his "Annotations on the Practical Part of Dr. Paley's Principles of Moral and Political Philoſophy." (See Vol. XIII. p. 263.) That call was, perhaps, expreſſed in words too warm for the occaſion. The Anti-Jacobin Reviewers do not pretend to be infallible. They were, perhaps, too haſty in ſuſpecting a latent evil tendency in the paſſage quoted, from Biſhop Butler, by Mr. Pearſon; though their evident anxiety, on the ſubject, demonſtrates how cautious they are of admitting aſſertions which but *ſeem* to carry with them a meaning contrary to the doctrines of our Church. Mr. Pearſon, however, with that candid politeneſs which can diſtinguiſh ſolicitude for right opinions from a bigotted zeal to propagate wrong ones, vouchſafed the explanation required, which our readers will find in our XIVth Vol. Pp. 98, 99. This explanation appeared no leſs than ſix months before our review of Dr. Gleig's ſermons; a circumſtance of which the Chriſtian Obſerver could not have been ignorant when he preſumed to accuſe us of cenſuring, in the caſe of Mr. Pearſon, opinions which we applauded in the caſe of Dr. Gleig. As Mr. Pearſon's letter to us was publiſhed without any delay, and accompanied on our part with no animadverſions, the Chriſtian Obſerver was bound to infer, that we were ſatisfied with his explanation, and did not, on more mature deliberation, diſapprove his ſentiments: and of this he ought to have informed his readers. Of this letter one paragraph is ſo peculiarly important that we wiſh it to be univerſally attended to; and as many, no doubt, occaſionally ſee the Anti-Jacobin Review who cannot turn to the volume in which it is contained, we have determined to re-print that paragraph.

"My meaning was, and probably the meaning of Biſhop Butler was the ſame, not to deny the depravation of human nature by the fall, but merely to guard againſt thoſe miſrepreſentations reſpecting it, which frequently occur in Calviniſtic writers, and by which, at the expence of the gratitude due to the gracious Author of our being, they furniſh men with excuſes for their own voluntary faults. When, even in countries profeſſing Chriſtianity, we ſpeak of men as actually indulging in vicious courſes, we can ſcarcely make uſe of terms too ſtrong for the occaſion. I do not think that, in this ſenſe, the 'corruption and degeneracy of the world' can eaſily be ſurpaſſed by deſcription. For, while I have a better opinion of *human nature* than the Calviniſts have, I have, perhaps, a worſe of *men themſelves*, even in what is ſometimes miſcalled their *ſanctified* ſtate. Notwithſtanding the many happy effects of the Goſpel revelation, the deſcription, which St. Paul has given us of the heathen world, may with too much juſtice be applied to the world as it is at preſent. But, when we ſpeak of human nature as the 'divine workmanſhip;' that is, when we ſpeak of men as they are born into the world, before they ſuffer themſelves to be corrupted by bad examples, or 'drawn away of their own luſts and enticed,' we ought to hold a different language, and to have regard to the caution which St. James has given us, not to caſt the blame of our ſins on our Maker. Though the image of God in man was defaced by the fall, it was not entirely deſtroyed; and, if you had recollected that, ſubſequently to the fall, and even to the deluge, the Scripture (Gen. ix. 6.) applies this honourable diſtinction to man, you would not have been ſo indignant at Biſhop Butler's application of it, nor have ſeen any reaſon for 'diſdaining to proceed.' I adopted and recommended,

mended, then, the ſentiment of Biſhop Butler, becauſe I ſuppoſed him to have the ſame notions reſpecting human nature, as I ſuppoſe our Saviour to have had, when, ſpeaking of little children, he ſaid, 'Of ſuch is the kingdom of God.' Our Saviour urges on men the neceſſity of *converſion*, in order to their becoming worthy members of that kingdom, from the conſideration of their being ſo unlike to what they were when they came into the world: "Except ye be *converted*, and become as *little children*, ye ſhall not enter into the kingdom of Heaven."

Will the Chriſtian Obſerver ſubſcribe to theſe notions, and particularly to thoſe contained in the three laſt ſentences? If he will there is no difference, on this ſubject at leaſt, between him and us. But we venture to foretel that he never will; though he will find it, we preſume, no eaſy taſk to convict them of heterodoxy. Theſe, however, are the notions of human nature which, wherever, in his volume of ſermons, he has occaſion to ſpeak of it, are inculcated by Dr. Gleig. We may here, however, with propriety take notice of another inſtance of the ſhameleſs effrontery with which theſe evangelical "True Churchmen" knowingly mutilate, in order to diſtort, the language of their opponents. The Chriſtian Obſerver quotes with diſapprobation an expreſſion of Dr. Gleig, in which the Doctor, he ſays, "ſpeaks of the mind being brought by reformation nearer to *its original ſtate of purity*." The Doctor's words are theſe: "On the contrary, we always conſider his mind," the mind of a man who has reformed his ill conduct, "as, by ſuch a reformation, brought nearer to its *original ſtate of purity*, than it was when corrupted by his former bad habits." Does the Chriſtian Obſerver deny that this is true? He cenſures Dr. Gleig too for "introducing the text 'God made man upright,' as applicable to mankind in general, and as diſproving the doctrine of the original depravity of our nature." To this accuſation we have nothing to reply but only that when the Chriſtian Obſerver ſhall have proved, by the context, or by any other proper medium of proof, that the text in queſtion was *not* intended, by Solomon, to be applicable to mankind in general, or that it has any relation to the doctrine of original ſin, we have little doubt that Dr. Gleig will retract his opinion, and become a convert to that of the Chriſtian Obſerver. It muſt, however, be obſerved that this writer ſeems incapable of ſtating any opinion of thoſe who differ from him in a fair point of view, for Dr. Gleig expreſsly introduces the text, and diſcourſes upon it, NOT for the purpoſe of diſproving either the original or acquired depravity of our nature, but of proving that men's tranſgreſſions proceed "from their own criminal inattention or deliberate perverſeneſs."

We ſhall now take leave of the Chriſtian Obſerver, at leaſt for the preſent. Hereafter, indeed, we may, perhaps, be more attentive to his proceedings than we have hitherto been. His general principles, we have often been told, are deſerving of the moſt unqualified reprobation; and the truth of this account we can readily believe: for, if the publication be uniformly conſiſtent, it is certainly one of the moſt dangerous and peſtilent which were ever employed to pervert or corrupt the religious and moral ſentiments of a people.

The Annual Review, and History of Literature for 1802. Arthur Aikin, Editor. Vol. I. Longman and Rees. 8vo. Pr. 978. 1803.

REVIEWS having been uſually publiſhed once in a month, readers are accuſtomed to expect them at thoſe ſtated periods; and from that very cuſtom, leſs diſpoſed to be favourable to periodical criticiſm, that occurs either at ſhorter or longer intervals. Hence a weekly paper, called the Sunday Review, and of which the object was criticiſm as well as politics, ſoon loſt its literary diſtinction, and was obliged to ſink into a common Sunday Newſpaper. We do not pretend to ſay, that the term of thirty or thirty-one days, is, by nature and reaſon, better ſuited to a ſurvey of new publications than any other; but ſuch being the common time, we look for ſuch works at its expiration. The Edinburgh Reviewers attempted three months, and as their work is ſaid to have begun with ſome appearance of ſucceſs, the Editor and proprietors have probably been thereby induced to extend the interval, and make the publication annual. That project we are far from cenſuring as impracticable, and deem the eventual ſucceſs neceſſarily to depend on the plan and execution; we therefore fully admit it poſſible, that there *may be* a very maſterly Annual Review, *if undertaken and executed by men of abilities and literature adequate to the task.* The conductors of the work before us have acted very fairly and candidly, in prefixing the name of the Editor: the public is thereby certified, that whatever critical talents, erudition, and diſcrimination, may be expected from the ſuperintendance of Mr. Arthur Aikin, will be found in the Annual Review. At the ſame time, we muſt confeſs ourſelves, when we read the title page, to have been ſomewhat at a loſs how we were to aſcertain the probable grounds of ſuch expectations, as we really were not acquainted with the literary reputation of the gentleman in queſtion, and conſequently the authority due to his name, or his qualifications for directing literary judgment. Dr. Aikin, and his talents and learning, we know as well as the purpoſes to which they were frequently applied: that gentleman, among his own ſet, paſſes, we are told, for an able and eloquent writer; and among impartial judges, as a pretty writer, without depth, ſtrength, or range. Mr. Arthur Aikin, we underſtand, is his ſon, and a good deal occupied about magazines and tranſlations; but we knew no more of him, until we looked over the preſent work, for which he renders himſelf reſponſible. Now we are better able to appreciate his editorial powers, and to eſtimate the ſanction which ſuch a production derives from the prefixed notification of "Arthur Aikin, Editor."

A very ſhort preface apologiſes for the *lateneſs* of the publication: we muſt candidly confeſs we do not ſee the neceſſity of ſuch an apology. If in other reſpects meritorious, the publication is ſufficiently early; *sat cito, si sat bene.* Our Editor pleads guilty to the charge of inexperience; we admit the modeſty of ſuch a confeſſion, but not the neceſſity that it ſhould be true. Why ſhould an Editor of a Review be inexperienced? Is the hiſtory and examination of learned works ſo unimportant, that a man *profeſſedly without experience* ſhould undertake the taſk?

In reviewing this Annual Review, we ſhall conſider the plan and the execution; the former may, in ſome degree, illuſtrate the extent and accuracy of the Editor's views, how far he is acquainted with the compartments of literature; the reſpective bearings and connections of the different claſſes,

claſſes, and his diſpoſition of the ſeveral heads, according to their nature and relations.

The work is divided into twenty-two chapters, and, like Pyramus and Thiſbe, as caſt by Bottom the weaver, each new ſcene has a prologue. The firſt chapter is devoted to voyages and travels: after ſuch ſubjects we naturally expected that the ſucceeding chapters would go on with other departments of narrative, but we find the ſecond has for its ſubject theology! The third conſiſts of hiſtory, politics, and ſtatiſtics; the fourth is occupied by geography alone. Fifth is Britiſh topography and antiquities; the ſixth, ancient claſſics; the ſeventh, modern languages; the eighth, education; the ninth, biography; the tenth, belles lettres and miſcellanies; the eleventh, novels and romances; the twelfth, law; the thirteenth, commerce; the fourteenth, military tactics; the fifteenth, rural œconomy, agriculture, and gardening; the ſixteenth, domeſtic œconomy; the ſeventeenth, medicine, ſurgery, anatomy, &c. the eighteenth, general ſcience; the nineteenth, mathematics; the twentieth, experimental philoſophy; the twenty-firſt mineralogy; and the twenty-ſecond natural hiſtory. Since our Editor *did attempt* to claſſify ſubjects of knowledge, taſte, literature, and ſcience, we think it might have been as well if the claſſification had followed the relation of the ſubjects. Able execution, however, might compenſate irregularity of plan, and the execution we ſhall now proceed to examine.

The execution we ſhall view in the principles and doctrines which are ſupported, the critical powers that are employed, and the literary talents which are evinced. So ſhall we learn whether Mr. Arthur Aikin and his coadjutors are men *diſpoſed* to promote the ſervice of religion, and that ſyſtem of faith and government by which wiſe and virtuous Britons with it to be upheld; and to maintain civil order and happineſs, and that ſyſtem of political eſtabliſhment which loyal and patriotic Britons deem not only conducive, but indiſpenſable to the preſervation of order and happineſs. So ſhall we learn whether theſe writers are, by ability, learning, and diſcernment, *qualified* for promulgating critical precepts, and delivering critical judgment:—alſo, whether their own labours afford diſplays of taſte and compoſition that prove the authors to be *examples of right* as well as cenſors of wrong.

The firſt article is Marchand's Voyage round the World, concerning which we have little to obſerve: the analyſis appears ſufficiently clear, and the concluſion "that Captain Marchand is an able navigator, and that Monſieur Fleurieu was perfectly qualified to compoſe the narrative of his voyage," is too vague to enable a reader to determine whether the author poſſeſſes, or do not poſſeſs, the ability of a critic. Several other accounts of voyages are of the ſame caſt, and conſiſt of paſſable analyſes, with copious extracts, but no critical eſtimates that can convey to the reader any preciſe or determinate opinion concerning the merits of the productions. The review of Fiſher's Travels through Spain is more lively and amuſing than any of the preceding articles; ſtill, however, it is deficient in critical effort. The account of Acerbi's travels is flat and inſipid, and contains no diſtinct expreſſion of the character of that work. Without farther particularization, we have to obſerve, that the firſt fourteen articles, containing five ſheets very cloſely printed, preſent nothing but ſketches and extracts, with common place obſervations, and a few general aſſertions, that neither convey to the reader any accurate knowledge nor judgment concerning

cerning the works profeſſed to be criticiſed, nor manifeſt any grounds to convince him that the writers are diſtinguiſhing and capable critics. On the other hand we admit, that hitherto inſtances of nonſenſe and abſurdity have not occurred, and as yet we have no opportunity of diſcovering either good or bad political principles. If neither very intereſting nor inſtructive, the work, thus far at leaſt, has the merit of being harmleſs.

The firſt article which calls forth ſpecific criticiſm is *Sonnini's Travels*; and the Reviewer demonſtrates, at leaſt, ardour of zeal, in praiſing the production of that ardent votary of revolutionary fraternity—that ſtaunch enemy of monarchy and religion—that uniform ridiculer of morality, violator of decency, and retailer of obſcenity—that boaſter of French atchievments that were never performed—that boundleſs panegyriſt of Buonaparté. "Shall we (ſays our critic) here enlarge on the genius, the taſte, and the ſcience of Sonnini? Is the editor of Buffon a tyro in ſcience? is his ſkill, or his acquirements as a naturaliſt, yet unknown? are we yet to be informed of the brilliancy of his imagination, the ſolidity of his underſtanding, and the philoſophic caſt of mind which he enjoys? At once, then, let us accompany our traveller, and confide in his narrative: his *fidelity* and his abilities have been equally tried." Here we firſt have obſerved the *predilection* of the Annual Reviewer, in his praiſes of an advocate of French fraternity, infidelity, debauchery, robbery, and murder.*

As

* As ſpecimens of the articles of belief which this diſtinguiſhed favourite of the Annual Reviewer profeſſes, we ſelect the two following; the firſt is an aſſertion adverſe to natural religion:—"There are (he ſays) here (at Palermo) private tombs belonging to opulent families, who, *even after annihilation*, diſdain to be confounded with the vulgar part of mankind." The next ſpecimen is againſt revealed religion: Sonnini follows up his denial of the immortality of the ſoul by an attack upon the Apoſtle Paul. In ſpeaking of Malta, he ſays: "The ſtrata of calcareous ſubſtances of the iſlands of Malta and Gozo likewiſe produce abundantly petrefactions and foſſils. It were eaſy to form ample collections of theſe. I have ſeen there ſea-urchins transformed to ſpar, very large vermiculars, oolithes, pirolites, the vertebræ of fiſhes of an enormous ſize, huge gloſſopetres, and very beautiful crapawdines. Theſe two laſt foſſils paſs with the common people for the tongues and eyes of ſerpents, though aſſuredly there is no great reſemblance between them: theſe are, in their apprehenſion, authentic and irreſiſtible evidence of the miraculous ſervice which St. Paul renders to their iſland, by deſtroying all the ſerpents. But this is not the only inſtance to prove, that under the hand of ignorance the hiſtory of nature has become that of *ſuperſtition*." Such are the *arguments* which the abettors of infidelity bring againſt the Goſpel. The ſame favourite of the Annual Reviewer, Sonnini, expounds his notions of the moral duties, in a few words, in ſpeaking of Cleopatra: "Poſterity (he ſays) carefully preſerves the memory of a woman, rendered illuſtrious by her magnificence, her genius, her heroic character, in her incomparable beauty; of the woman whoſe charms triumphed over the greateſt of the Romans; of the woman, finally, whom we can approach *only with the ſallies of a paſſion* not eaſily reſtrained in an ardent ſoul, and under a burning ſky, at which the Graces diſdain not to ſmile, and which nature does not diſavow." Theſe ſallies of Cleopatra's

ardent

As our Reviewer further proceeds with the work of this faithful narrator and *solid philosopher*, he, with great praise, mentions a hint of Sonnini, which, he justly observes, was too obvious to be mistaken, that some new enterprising genius should arise, to carry into Egypt victory and freedom, that is, Corsican victory and freedom, but what well-affected Britons would call robbery and slavery. We perfectly agree with the Reviewer, that despotism is adverse to commerce and the arts, but we never before heard that a despotical form of government is favourable *to the production of locusts*. Our author concludes this Review with an observation that we do not believe to be new; the amount is, that Greece is a very fine country, and that the Turks are very tyrannical rulers. The Review of Sonnini ascertains the political, religious, and moral creed of the Annual Reviewer. The travels of Olivier afford to our critic farther opportunities of demonstrating the Turkish government to be a ferocious despotism: as such, we agree with him in reprobating it; though we must observe, that in the production of Olivier the civil and natural history is much more important than the political remarks, and even more deserving of the critic's attention. The last article in this chapter is Denon's travels, and two translations of them; one by Mr. Aikin, the Editor, and the other by Mr. Kendall. Mr. Aikin's is, of course, preferred, where *he himself is at once party and judge*. The first chapter consists of a hundred and twenty pages of analysis and extracts; but without one critical examination from the beginning to the end. The political principles appear, but are not hitherto very frequently obtruded.

The Annual Reviewer is evidently an admirer of revolution and its votaries, but Jacobinism, we must candidly admit, in the first chapter does not often expose herself; *she merely shews that she is there*. The next chapter is the subject of theology: the account of Reeve's Bible is extremely superficial, and very inadequate to such a very meritorious work. High praise is bestowed upon the works of Mr. Newcome Cappe, who entertained a variety of heterodox notions, some peculiar, and others common. Mr. Cappe, it appears, is a decided *Unitarian*; and from the commendations which the Annual Reviewer bestows on his productions, we should suspect that critic to be of the same persuasion himself; but of this we may probably learn more as we follow his criticisms on theology.

Paley on the evidences of natural and revealed religion, is an article which, from an able Reviewer, would have certainly drawn forth one of his best specimens, as few works, either in object or execution, deserve such fulness of consideration. The Annual Reviewer, as usual with him, presents a general sketch, and very ample extracts. The critical estimate is comprised in the following passage: "Whatever Dr. Paley takes in hand he makes interesting and useful. He renders plain truths still plainer: he resolves with care what have been considered as difficulties; and by the perspicuity of his style, the clearness of his arrangements, and the simpli-

---

ardent soul, which this *moralist* considers as a justification of her conduct, it must be acknowledged, produced *only* prostitution, adultery, robbery, murder, war, and devastation, over three quarters of the globe; and were, therefore, according to the creeds of the French revolutionists and their British admirers, whether these Jacobins assumed the character of Reviewers or any other.

city

city and the beauty of his illuſtrations, he captivates the moſt inattentive, and delights the moſt improved mind." Though this obſervation has been repeated times without number, yet we do not object to its *repetition once more*. In the following article very high praiſe is beſtowed on its author, Theophilus Lindſey. The performance is ſtyled "The pleaſing and valuable Legacy of *this most excellent and valuable Man*," and, according to the critic, the more worthy of belief, *because the author is eighty years of age*. Having ſpent a great part of his life in aſſerting that Chriſt is not God, and denying the exiſtence of the Holy Ghoſt, the legacy which he bequeaths is a full and free acquittance to his votaries from all fears of the devil. By Mr. Lindſey's account, there is no ſuch being as a devil, and his doctrines our Annual Reviewers very highly approve. We make no doubt that their friend Sonnini maintains a ſimilar opinion, and here we gain, or at leaſt acquire, a farther inſight *into the religious belief of our Annual Reviewers*. The next important article is Daubeny's Diſcourſes: here our Reviewers attempt facetiouſneſs, a quality which we have not before diſcovered them to poſſeſs. Mr. Daubeny gives ſuch an account of the devil as the Scriptures teach. This account ſerves our Reviewers as a ſubject for a joke. Daubeny is farther cenſured, becauſe he is no friend to the Unitarians. The lectures of Bp. Porteus are, very properly and deſervedly, the ſubject of a long article; but it contains little criticiſm, though very ample extracts. The attempted analyſis does not lay before us much of the Prelate's doctrines, but is not ſparing in laying before us the doctrines of the Annual Reviewers. The following may ſerve *as a ſample*: "the twelfth lecture being the laſt that was delivered in the year 1799, is cloſed by an earneſt recommendation of a ſtrict obſervance of the enſuing week, *commonly called* Paſſion-week. "In that week," obſerves his Lordſhip, "all public diverſions are, as you well know, wiſely prohibited by public authority; and in conformity to the ſpirit of ſuch prohibition, we ſhould, even in our own families, and in our own private amuſements, be temperate, modeſt, decorous, and diſcreet." P. 323. "There are, however, (ſays our Annual Reviewer) thoſe, among whom, notwithſtanding this *loose, inaccurate language*, is the Biſhop of London himſelf, who are of opinion, that not in Paſſion-week alone, but at all times, and in all ſeaſons, Chriſtians ought to be temperate, modeſt, decorous, and diſcreet. Had his Lordſhip then no apprehenſion, that by enforcing with ſo much ſolemnity the obſervance of a particular ſeaſon, it might be inferred by ſome, that at other times ſo much caution and watchfulneſs would not be neceſſary? Are there none who would not chearfully comply with ſuch a requiſition, as a kind of commutation for their general irregularities? Is there not conſiderable danger, that thoſe who are thus exhorted to make a pauſe in the faſhionable career of diſſipation and folly, when the ſeaſon allotted to that purpoſe is over, will plunge with renewed alacrity into the vortex, under the perſuaſion, that having by this penance made their peace with heaven, they are left at full liberty to indulge themſelves to the utmoſt, till the ſeaſon of penitence and retirement comes round again?" This paſſage introduces us ſtill farther to an acquaintance with the *eccleſiaſtical ſentiments of the Annual Reviewer*. The object of theſe remarks evidently is to *diſparage the periodical obſervances which the eſtabliſhed Church of England deems neceſſary for nouriſhing Chriſtianity*. The ſame arguments which the Reviewer employs againſt peculiar attention to that period which, according to his phraſeology, is *commonly called* Paſſion-week, might apply with equal

equal force to the celebration of the Sabbath, and we ſhould, according to that hypotheſis, abſtain from going to church, leſt performance of religious worſhip ſhould weaken religious ſentiments. The wiſeſt men in all ages have recommended not only habitual devotion, but ſtated ſeaſons for cheriſhing thoſe ſentiments by external worſhip. *The Annual Reviewers of the theological articles are evidently non-conformists:* ſuch are not the wiſeſt men of Britain. Farther to demonſtrate their averſeneſs to the articles of the Church of England, the Annual Reviewers proceed *to ſneer at the Biſhop, becauſe he maintains the doctrine of original ſin.* Few things are impoſſible to a willing mind; a lecture upon Pontius Pilate, containing a juſt panegyric on the integrity of Britiſh Judges: our Reviewer reviles the holders of theſe high offices. Within a few articles after this, our Reviewer reaches ſingle ſermons: his firſt criticiſm on one of theſe contains an invective againſt the Lord Biſhop of Cheſter, whom he endeavours to diſparage, *becauſe he is a Biſhop.* A ſermon delivered by Mr. Patterſon, of Trinity College, Oxford, imputes the French Revolution to the followers of Voltaire, Rouſſeau, D'Alembert, and repeats a common obſervation, that Locke was in reality a prime mover of the democratic doctrines. Our Reviewer reprobates this opinion, which moſt animadverters on the French Revolution, and its influence in England, have often delivered, and many of them have ſhewn the progreſs from Locke's refinement to modern democracy. In diſcuſſing the ſermon of Thomas Belſham to the Unitarian congregation, our Reviewer inveighs againſt ſuch members of the Eſtabliſhed Church as think unfavourably of the doctrines and conduct of thoſe nonconformiſts who carry diſſent to hereſy. The ſermon in queſtion (he ſays) affords a complete refutation of thoſe malevolent calumnies which are yet too induſtriouſly propagated, by illiberal and bigotted perſons, againſt a numerous claſs of our countrymen, who, conſcientiouſly diſſenting from the Eſtabliſhed Church, are "not inſenſible to the general excellence of the Britiſh conſtitution, nor to the great benefits which they, in common with their fellow-ſubjects, enjoy under it." The next two ſermons, the one delivered by a diſſenter at Leeds, and expatiating upon the evils of war, without taking its neceſſity into the account; the ſecond railing againſt the late conteſt that Britain was compelled to carry on againſt the ambition of France, are here highly praiſed by the *impartial pen of the Annual Reviewer.* Conſiderable ſpace is allotted to other diſſenting articles of the ſame kind, which are panegyrized on the ſame principle. After dwelling with pleaſure and praiſe on the diſcourſes of the Unitarians, and other ſchiſmatics, that are as deficient in literary ability and the powers of compoſition as in ſound reaſoning and genuine Chriſtianity, our Reviewer comes to a ſermon of the Biſhop of Llandaff, which he ſlurs over in a few lines. Next is a diſcourſe preached at the conſecration of the Lord Biſhop of Glouceſter, and from it our Reviewer, in the true ſpirit of ſectarian partizanſhip, fails not to inveigh againſt the votaries of our Church who ſupport the divine origin of Prelacy. Soon after follows a very flaming eulogium on a Mr. John Corry, who has, it ſeems, written two and twenty pages, octavo, in praiſe of the diſſenters. Our Reviewer now goes on to eccleſiaſtical hiſtory and Church diſcipline: this portion of the work contains little deſerving of particular remark, being in the ſame general ſpirit of diſſenting partiality, executed in the ſame ſtyle of deſultory ſketch and large quotation, with aſſertion both of panegyric and cenſure, without proofs; and deficient in critical diſcrimination and ability. As the firſt chapter diſco-

vered

vered a prepoſſeſſion in favour of the revolutionary doctrines, the ſecond diſplays that partiality to the enemies of the Church, and averſion to her friends and ſupporters, which diſtinguiſhed the Analytical Review, and other works of the ſame ſchool. From peruſing this chapter on theology, no reader would be able to form a fair eſtimate of the theological literature of 1802, which the Annual Reviewers profeſs to exhibit; he merely ſees a ſectarian partizan pleading for ſchiſmatics; and againſt the Church, in the uſual ſtyle of the enemies of the articles and diſcipline of our Church, aſcribing much more importance to diſſenting polemics, than they deſerve in the maſs of Engliſh divinity. Chapter third has for its ſubject hiſtory, politics, and ſtatiſtics. Under this head our Reviewer attempts criticiſm much more than in the two former. After a ſketch and quotations from Tytler's Elements of general Hiſtory, and Turner's account of the Anglo-Saxons, our critic comes to the hiſtory of George the Third, by John Adolphus, Eſq. and here we muſt ſay that the critic *lets out* his political ſentiments and paſſions ſo fully and unequivocally, that no reader, from that time, can poſſibly doubt how the Annual Reviewer thinks and feels reſpecting the Britiſh Conſtitution and the Britiſh King. But let our critic ſpeak for himſelf, and let us hear him in his introduction. "Mably, in his Theory of Hiſtory Writing, has obſerved, that, whatever the period or ſubject choſen, the Annaliſt ſhould endeavour to detect the leading current, the main drift of the incidents, and then imbue himſelf with that particular form of bias or prejudice which tends to value higheſt, and to be moſt intereſted about, the chief buſineſs of his hiſtory. Let a zeal for democracy animate the deſcriber of Athens; let a ſolicitude for territorial aggrandizement be held important by the hiſtorian of Rome. The Annaliſt of the Popes ſhould have at heart the diffuſion and magnificence of religion; the biographer of the Medici ſhould take an excluſive delight in the progreſs of literature and art. Where unity of purpoſe is wanting, either in national or individual purſuits, the intereſt excited by them is feeble; the proſpect diverges into indiſtinctneſs; the motive of all the buſineſs and buſtle is forgotten, and the heroes of an hiſtorical drama ſeparate into a band of players. In the life and conduct of George the Third, it ſeems difficult, at firſt glance, to detect the ruling paſſion or binding principle of his actions. One ſees, it is true, much to praiſe; he ſets an example of the houſehold virtues, *which has given a ſort of faſhion to the conjugal affections*; and thus has preſerved and increaſed domeſtic happineſs among innumerable families of the empire. He diſplays a great frugality, which in a prince who is hourly called upon to give, yet has only the property of his ſubjects to beſtow, is a moſt difficult and meritorious quality; a frugality too, the parent of order and economy among the imitative higher ranks of landed and commercial opulence, and thus a ſource of regular gain and punctual payments to a vaſt maſs of induſtry. But in ſtudying the Royal ſtateſmanſhip, the political interference of majeſty with the public concerns of the country, one is apt to ſee much to blame; one is often at a loſs for a ſatisfactory defence, or even a natural explanation. Our author has imperceptibly found it in an analogous bent of mind. He too is *a ſectator of Church and King politics:* he too has a diſintereſted love of the cauſe of Toryiſm. There is thus all that adaptation, which Mably recommends, between the movement of the hiſtory and the ſpirit of the hiſtorian." *The evident object of this paſſage is to degrade the political character of the King, and to charge our Sovereign with ſentiments and conduct adverſe to the princi-*

ples of the British Constitution. The Annual Reviewer cenſures the hiſtorian, *because he is a ſupporter of Church and King:* no doubt monarchy and hierarchy muſt expect the invectives of republicans and ſchiſmatics, but the Proſpectus of the Annual Review promiſes that the work ſhall ſupport the eſtabliſhed Conſtitution. The pledge is contained in the following ſtrong and unequivocal terms: "*On all occaſions, we ſhall be found the friends of good order; of domeſtic quiet; of that venerable Conſtitution, which has ſo long approved itſelf the bulwark of our liberties; and of that ſublime and pure religion, the precepts and promiſes of which contain the beſt helps and ſtrongeſt incentives to virtuous conduct.*" We aſk Mr. Aikin, the editor, whether cenſure of a writer for ſupporting Church and King, be a performance of the promiſe that the Annual Reviewers ſhall be found friends of our venerable Conſtitution? We farther aſk, whether an accuſation of our Sovereign, as deficient in the conſtitutional principles and conduct, be the evidences by which the Annual Reviewers prove themſelves the friends of good order and domeſtic quiet? Another proof of this friendſhip for good order we find in an obſervation on a paſſage in the hiſtory, which records the aſſociations and petitions of 1780, for the profeſſed purpoſe of procuring reform. They began in Yorkſhire, and as the hiſtorian ſtates, the example was followed by many other counties and cities throughout the kingdom. The narrative very truly ſtates the proceedings of ſuch reformers to have been extremely violent, and the hiſtorian, not without reaſon, thinks, that the *numbers* of thoſe who, in a popular ferment, ſubſcribe reſolutions agreeable to the prevailing paſſion, is no proof of the wiſdom of ſuch reſolutions. Our Annual Reviewer greatly blames this doctrine of Mr. Adolphus, which is certainly unfriendly to the uncontrouled dominion of the mob, and to that branch of Jacobin ethics which holds forth the *ſacred duty of inſurrection.* But let us hear the Reviewer himſelf expatiate on the benefit of popular tumults, and we think our loyal and patriotic readers will agree with us, that few paſſages can be pointed out more hoſtile to good order and domeſtic quiet. "Popular zeal and interference, even when miſdirected, is a ſymptom of vigour and energy in nations; thoſe opinions and proceedings which tend to repreſs its ebullitions, are ſymptoms of ſenility and exhauſtion: from the eruptive fever of democratic effervescence, countries recover by ſlight and temperate effuſions of conceſſion; but from the paſſive ſullenneſs of inirritable deſpair, there is no convaleſcence. We lament, therefore, when hiſtorians take amiſs ſuch ſtirrings and commotions of the people" Were Maillard or Marat Reviewers of the article in queſtion, there would be nothing inconſiſtent in the encouraging *ſuch ſtirrings and commotions of the people*; it was the buſineſs of their reſpective lives to excite tumult and inſurrection, and they, on many and divers occaſions, practically atteſted their conviction of the doctrine here promulgated by the Annual Reviewer; and they particularly bore teſtimony to it, the former in leading a mob to overawe legiſlature, and inſult and frighten the King at Verſailles. On their way they hanged ſeveral prieſts and other ariſtocrats. *In the eruptive fever of democratic effervescence,* they maſſacred the King's ſervants, and had almoſt maſſacred the King and his conſort themſelves; but at length they were prevailed on ſo far to repreſs their *ebullitions,* as to be contented with dragging their ſovereign in triumphant captivity. Marat expreſſed his aſſent to the ſame doctrine, moſt unequivocally, in Auguſt and September 1792, and afterwards under the government of Robeſpierre; but neither Maillard or Marat profeſſed themſelves

ſelves the friends of domeſtic quiet and good order. The ſame want of ſound judgment which is manifeſted in abetting popular licentiouſneſs, tumults, and inſurrections, alſo appears in the bombaſtic phraſeology. Conſider the paſſage in this view: "*Thoſe opinions and proceedings which tend to repreſs its ebullitions, are ſymptoms of ſenility and exhauſtion; from the eruptive fever of democratic effervescence, countries recover by ſlight and temperate effuſions of conceſſion; but from the paſſive ſullenneſs of inirritable deſpair there is no convaleſcence.*" The literary compoſition of this paſſage, and the competency of ſuch a writer to correct and regulate the public taſte, we ſhall leave to others to conſider. This Review of Adolphus's Hiſtory merely ſerves as a vehicle of the Reviewer's enmity to our Church and King, and predilection for mob government. It is not a criticiſm upon the hiſtory of Adolphus; for it neither analyſes his work, ſums up evidence, nor delivers any definite judgment. From reading this article we only collect detached ſcraps, and ſee nothing of the thread of the ſtory, and very little of the views of the author.

The account of Home's hiſtory of the Rebellion, conſiſts of vague obſervations, and copious extracts. The Reviewer ſpeaks *con amore* not of the object and enterprize, an attempt of miſapplied loyalty, but of the ſtirring and commotion of the people, and inſurrection againſt eſtabliſhed government. "Who is not (ſays the Reviewer) curious to learn, in what manner the ſymptoms of ſuch great revolutions declare themſelves? How unimportant is the zeal of office, and the formality of police, againſt the *ſweeping* tide of *inactive* opinion, which diſarmed the one, and inſtalled the other army, by the mere oſtentation of timidity, and the *affected perſonation* of apprehenſion." Both the ſentiments and language of this paſſage contain internal evidence that it is done by the ſame hand who, in the article laſt mentioned, ſpoke in favour of popular violence, and produced ſuch choice phraſes as "ſenility and exhauſtion, democratic effervescence," and "inirritable deſpair."

The editor, in his proſpectus, informs us, that his coadjutors are ſuch as to juſtify the moſt ſanguine hopes of ſucceſs. Is the writer of ſuch articles one of thoſe who is to render the work ſucceſsful? The hiſtory of the Union between Britain and Ireland, by Dr. Coote, is the ſubject of an article which contains various undeniable truths. Our Reviewer, in his introduction, undertakes to prove, that if ſtates are ſmall, there is a leſs chance of defending themſelves, than if they are large and powerful. This poſition he deems it neceſſary to illuſtrate by having recourſe to a ſeries of *ifs* concerning ancient nations. If the Ionians had uſed their opportunities of conſolidating the cities of Aſia Minor into one federal ſtate, they would probably have acquired more extenſive power. "If the European Greeks had veſted in the Amphictyonic council the paramount ſovereignty, thoſe parith quarrels and feuds of Spartans, and Athenians, and Thebans, and Corinthians, might have been prevented; and the courage of Sparta, the talent of Athens, the probity of Thebes, and the luxury of Corinth, have been made to co-operate in the extenſion and embelliſhment of a Greek republic, the eventual miſtreſs of the fertility of Sicily, and of that maritime ſtrength of Rhodes, the ſucceſsful antagoniſt of Philip, and, perhaps, the competitreſs of Rome." The ſame poſition he thinks it neceſſary to illuſtrate farther through modern hiſtory: from the tranſactions of Holland, Switzerland, and other ſtates, to prove that ſtrength and union can better reſiſt attack than feebleneſs and diſunion. Having thus laboured during two pages to prove

what no perſon either did or could deny, our Reviewer proceeds to criticiſm, and preſents ſomewhat of an analyſis and very ample quotations, and theſe, with two or three lines at the concluſion, form the review. The Naval Hiſtory of the late War, compiled by William Stewart Roſe, affords our Annual Reviewers opportunities of vindicating their republican friends the French. The Hiſtory of the Riſe and Progreſs of the Naval Power of England, by Mr. Evenſon White, is the ſubject of a very paſſable article, which contains an accurate analyſis, interſperſed with a few obſervations. Ranken's hiſtory of France undergoes a ſhort diſcuſſion of four pages, three of which conſiſt of quotations. The Annals of the French Revolution, by Bertran de Moleville, opens ſubjects that are moſt dear to the Reviewer's heart. The Annaliſt mentions a charge that has been repeatedly urged againſt Briſſot of being venal and corrupt, and the Reviewer reprobates the obſervation as an unjuſt attack on ſuch a ſtaunch republican. Playfair, in his Hiſtory of Jacobiniſm, mentions the ſame charge with more ſpecific particularization, and it has been generally believed by impartial perſons, who regarded the total abſence of moral principle in the Briſſotines, a probable ground of ſuſpicion. We have not before us the documents, but, to the beſt of our recollection, there is authentic evidence of bribery received by Briſſot for a pretended negociation with the court, at the time he was expatiating againſt monarchy, and alſo of an offer on the ſide of Briſſot to releaſe the king, and facilitate his eſcape, for no leſs a ſum than half a million ſterling: but either the money not being forth coming, or the ſincerity of this Jacobin being doubted, no attempt was made to carry the propoſition into effect. The Annual Reviewers, however, will not admit documented facts contrary to their friend the republican Briſſot. Briſſot is farther repreſented by the Reviewer to have been friendly to an alliance with England. Againſt this clauſe of his advocate's pleadings there happen to be ſeveral ſtrong facts, eſpecially the celebrated pamphlet of Briſſot himſelf, publiſhed in 1793, and one of the chief proofs adduced by Lord Mornington, at the opening of the ſeſſions, 1793-4, of the hoſtile diſpoſitions of the French rulers. Briſſot and the Girondiſts are repreſented as averſe to the proceedings of the 10th of Auguſt, but, againſt this aſſertion of our Reviewer, there happens to be Briſſot's own newſpapers, and the addreſſes which he circulated to the army and people, extolling the ſuſpenſion of the king on that day; recommending the abolition of monarchy, and propoſing a plan of a national convention. Therefore, though this profeſſed Review of Bertrand be really little more than a panegyric on that arch favourite of Engliſh republicans, Briſſot, the Reviewers, happening to be totally ignorant of the ſubject which they unſeaſonably introduce, make aſſertions directly contrary to notorious facts. Soulavie's Political Memoirs are deſcribed with deſerved ſeverity on the humble tribute of a contemptible and profligate minion of every French government that had been ſucceſſively uppermoſt to the preſent tyrant, Bonaparte. It is not, however, the proſtitution of this underling that calls forth the reprobation of the Reviewer, but the diſapprobation of revolutionary republicaniſm, which Soulavie expreſſes to pleaſe the uſurper. Soulavie repreſents all former changes as bad, in order to enhance the goodneſs of that which rendered the Corſican deſpot of France. This attempt calls from our Reviewer a more detailed and connected confeſſion of his own faith concerning the bleſſings of the revolutionary ſpirit. "Throughout the work (he ſays) the changes that have taken place are repreſented as diſadvantageous. With this ſentiment we cannot wholly coincide. That an inhabitant of Holland,

or

or Switzerland, should deprecate the French revolution as the immediate cause of his evils, is not surprizing. To those countries it has been merely injurious: but to assert that France has no wise been benefited, is to be rash and inattentive. Despotic regulations, unjust laws, even marked the interregnum of Robespierre; but in general the legislative changes have dismissed the burthens, and have added greatly to the liberties of the people. The abolition of the feudal system, which, even under the present retroactive and counter-revolutionary administration, is in no degree restored, compensates for heavy transient evils. Property is subdivided; equality diffused; the wages of labour augmented; instruction facilitated; toleration conceded; the lines of advancement multiplied, and open to the talents of every one. The publicity of legislation, if not independence, is established: an elective, if not a self-willed constitution, is introduced. The friends of liberty have been much too sanguine in their calculations: they expected that a nation inured to slavery should instantaneously shake off its fetters, and act as though habituated to its new situation. Does the bird nursed in the cage know where to fly when set free; or how to provide for its numerous wants? But we are not, therefore, to conclude, that nature intended it for captivity. If foreign importance and consequence is to be reckoned among national advantages, when did the influence of France predominate so much as at the present time? When was her peace more glorious; when her warfare more formidable? Besides, it is probably an error to consider the French revolution as already finished. The present military despotism cannot always last; especially if peace *sets in.* That once removed, it may safely be asserted, that no government will be permanent in France, which has not for its basis the rights of the people. Many erroneous doctrines have been propagated, anarchy has been mistaken for freedom, and irreligion for philosophy; but political truths have been proclaimed, which are taking deep root in Europe, and which no exertions of despotism can now eradicate. Though the French have been compelled by an usurper to dissemble or retract their political creed, that creed is not therefore the less true. Because Galileo had to renounce, as heresy, his theory of the planetary system, are men to believe him in an error? As durable as his theory will be some of the political axioms proclaimed by the French revolution." We have frequently heard it asserted, that Jacobinism has ceased to exist in this country. Forming our judgment from reason and observation, we have never failed to deny this assertion, and a stronger corroboration could not be afforded us than *this creed of the Annual Reviewers, declaring their faith in the miraculous benefits which are to accrue from their beloved revolutionary doctrines.*—The professed Review of Sir Robert Wilson's History consists of nine pages, eight and a half of which are quotation, and the other half page of desultory remarks. We do not object in the Annual Reviewers being very copious in quotations, their quotations are generally the best parts of their work. The account by Reynier is very highly praised. The introduction to the Review of Maurice's Indostan, and indeed the whole of that article, is better written than many others by the Annual Reviewers. The Review of an Essay on the means of rendering revolutions useful, discovers a range of observation, and depth of reflection, considerably beyond the usual reach of the Annual Reviewers. The criticisms on Gentz, concerning the state of Europe, and on several successive publications, endeavour to stigmatize the late war as Anti jacobin; a proof that the Reviewer knows very little of its history, or, at least, has not penetration to understand its

principles. One great ſource of its miſcarriages was, that it was not an Anti-jacobin war; it was a war of ſcramble without unity of object, concert of plan, and co-operation of effort. The Review of ſeveral pamphlets proves our Reviewer to be an advocate for the peace, and an advocate on the ſame grounds with its other democratical votaries. In ſeveral ſhort articles, our Reviewer abuſes Anti-jacobin writers; long may we, and others of ſimilar ſentiments, be objects of ſuch invectives. While we continue to ſupport the king and conſtitution, church and ſtate, and to attack their enemies, we ſhall not fail to be traduced by thoſe enemies. It is obſerved, in a book which Jacobins ridicule, but we Anti-jacobins venerate above all books, that "they who do evil hate the light, leſt being brought to the light their deeds be reproved." The calumniator of Anti-jacobins, church and king, as a ſet-off for ſlander againſt loyalty, hierarchy, and monarchy, in reviewing the late general election, beſtows very high panegyrics on Sir Francis Burdett, and ſuch Reviews might have been highly reliſhed by certain claſſes of Middleſex electors, at the celebration of the demagogue's victory after the noted dinner at the Crown and Anchor.

Qui Bavium non odit, amet tua carmina Mævi.

We have already had occaſion to remark the bombaſt of expreſſion which mingles with the abſurdity of Jacobinical criticiſm. It is an attempted character of Lord Grenville's oratory, contained in the following paſſage! Its merits muſt be ſought in the exhauſtive multiplicity of his reaſons, and the aſtoniſhing latitude of his amplifications, in a certain *lathery tautology*, which makes a mouthful of breath into a *cistern full of sud*; and ſurprizes, if not by the rapidity, at leaſt by the *volume of its dilatation*.

This muſt be the ſame Reviewer who gratified us with the democratic effervescence and inirritable deſpair. We do not think it poſſible for two writers attempting to diſguiſe nonſenſe by glaring fuſtian, ſo exactly to hit the ſame mode of thraſonic phraſeology; and it unfortunately happens, that the Reviewer introduces a quotation from Lord Grenville's ſpeech, which is a clear and ſtrong chain of authentic fact, unqueſtionable poſition, and legitimate deduction, being in a page, a conciſe, but complete account of maritime law in reſpect to neutral ſhips, and we thank the Reviewer for having preſented to us ſo very maſterly and valuable a citation.

On ſubjects not directly connected with monarchy, hierarchy, or the able and active ſupporters of theſe inſtitutions, we find judicious and uſeful articles. Thornton's enquiry into the paper-credit of Great Britain, calls forth the following paſſage, which, though a diſſertation, rather than a criticiſm, we ſhall quote as a favourable ſpecimen of the good ſenſe and knowledge which ſome of thoſe Reviewers occaſionally exert on topics which do not happen to ſtir their jacobinical prepoſſeſſions, "Paper-currency is not fictitious. Their iſſuers are become bankrupts, as a town may be burnt down; but, while it exiſted, it was a real property. For every note which a banker iſſues, he receives a depoſit in hard caſh. This caſh he lends out to various trades, in ſhares proportioned to his opinion of their reſponſibility: he uſually founds his opinion on the amount of the fixed property which they poſſeſs, or their warehouſes, machines, work-rooms, dwellings, and viſible worth: of their other property he cannot judge, and he, therefore does not truſt to it. There always exiſts then, in a ſolid and viſible form, in the form of houſes, buildings, and goods, the whole maſs of property, which is paid to a banker for his notes. Though not ſuddenly convertible, his notes, like aſſignats,

aſſignats, are mortgaged on a ſubſtantial exiſtency. In a word, *they are a machine for rendering fixed property circulable.* They enable the country to derive from its *biens fonds*, not only, like other countries, a rent, an income, a yearly revenue, but to employ their capital value beſides in productive induſtry. Bills of exchange are a repreſentation of circulating productions, as banker's notes are of fixed property. The owner of corn, of ſilk, of manufactured goods, draws, when he ſhips them, on the buyer, for the value of theſe commodities, payable at or after the probable period of their delivery, or ſale. The bill being diſcharged, the contract is completed. In this tranſaction, the bill of exchange is no leſs the repreſentative of an extant property, of corn, of ſilk, or manufactured goods, than the money tendered at a ſhop in payment of a pair of gloves. In both places a real barter takes place. That the period of drawing is frequently by agreement diſtant from that of ſhipping, that ſubdiviſions of labour intervene, which often occaſions the producer of a commodity to draw upon the metropolis of his own country, while a banker, or other intermediate agent of exchange, draws on that of the country receiving their goods, may complicate, but cannot alter, the nature of the tranſaction. Bills of exchange are the repreſentatives of commodities in voyage or in warehouſe; and they appear on an average to be coined at the production, and diſcharged at the conſumption of the articles of commerce which they repreſent, and thus to be dependant on commodities both for creation and duration. Unleſs the commodity exiſted firſt, the bill of exchange would not have been drawn. Accommodation bills themſelves are but an apparent exception to this rule; they convey real power over the fixed or the circulating property of the iſſuers and endorſers; and, although this property may be conſumed, before that diſcharge, the tranſferers, in fact, ſpeculate on its ſufficient duration. There is no other difference between a banker's note and a bill of exchange, than that the one tranſfers a power over a fixed property of a given neighbourhood, and therefore wanders about the neighbourhood where that property remains; and the other tranſfers a power over the moveable property of commerce, and therefore follows that property from its ſource to its place of abſorption. Whoever buys, muſt pay for what he buys; immediately, if he wants credit, remotely, if he can aſſign over an eventual ſincerity. It is thus with nations. When a bill of exchange has reached the place on which it was drawn, it is become, like a banker's note, a form of circulating the fixed property of the acceptor. Bills of exchange, therefore, put in circulation the fixed property of nations. They render the houſes and ſtreets of Hamburgh, the acres and foreſts along the Suſquehannah, circulable in London or Amſterdam. The whole property of Altona, or Philadelphia, may thus come to veſt in the inhabitants of London. But as it would not be convenient to them to take actual poſſeſſion, in proportion as this property pledges itſelf in their hands, they offer it for ſale at a lower and lower rate. That is, the courſe of exchange becomes more favourable to the indebted, and leſs favourable to the crediting country. Bills are ſold by brokers to the higheſt bidder. If drafts abound on a particular place, they tend to ſink in value. If drafts are ſcarce on a particular place, they tend to riſe in value. This is in fact a fluctuation in London of the fixed property in Hamburgh; at Amſterdam, of the fixed property in Philadelphia. The firſt recourſe of a private merchant to get in uncertain debts, is to import the moveable property of his correſpondents; and the firſt recourſe of a nation to realize its demands, is to import the moveable property of a foreign country. This is

accompliſhed by lowering the courſe of exchange. Hamburgh owes much to London; conſequently, drafts on Hamburgh abound in the London bill market; conſequently they are ſold cheap, below the par or average price of ſuch drafts; the hemp and iron at Hamburgh may conſequently be bought in London with a leſs quantity of capital than before, although the price ſhould continue unaltered at Hamburgh. This brings on an artificial importation, until the balance of exchange is again in equipoiſe."

The Reviewer of Pinkerton's Geography preſents an accurate analyſis, and in that reſpect, his article is much ſuperior to many other works; but, though that performance certainly poſſeſſes conſiderable merit, we think that the Reviewer, in imputing to Mr. Pinkerton too much modeſty, *because*, in his preface, he profeſſes to aſpire at no higher praiſe than being the *Strabo of the modern world*, he charges the author unjuſtly with diffidence. But it ſeems Mr. Pinkerton has not executed the whole himſelf, he has been aſſiſted by the *comprehensive science* of Mr. Arthur Aikin, the editor of this work. *I, P. P. Clerk of this parish, writeth this book.* The ſaid P. P. bears teſtimony, that he himſelf poſſeſſed very extraordinary political knowledge, and why may not Mr. A. A. bear teſtimony that he poſſeſſes extraordinary ſcientific knowledge. Pinkerton's work is the only article in the chapter upon geography. Next comes topography, including antiquities. Britton's and Brayley's Beauties of England and Wales is an entertaining article *from the extracts*. An hiſtorical and deſcriptive account of Bath affords the Reviewer an opportunity of delivering a very new piece of literary hiſtory that the prototype of Fielding's Allworthy was Mr. Allen of Prior Park. Coates's Hiſtory of the Antiquities of Reading is a ſatisfactory analyſis. The remarks on the turgid language of Lipſcomb's Tour deſerve attention from all who have a pruriency to ſounding and far fetched words, and therefore ought to be cloſely ſtudied by the Reviewer who employed ſuch phraſes, as *ſmptoms of senility, lathery*, tautology, and others of the ſame family, which ſo often abound in this *corrector of composition*, the Annual Reviewer.—The next chapter has for its ſubject the ancient claſſics: and, after a common place introduction, full of great names, contains an able article on Heyne's Homer. The writer who executed this critiſm, appears not to be of the ſame claſs as the other Annual Reviewers. Several other articles in the ſame chapter are tolerably well reviewed, but none equal to Heyne. The criticiſm on Gifford's Juvenal is evidently the production of a writer who does not underſtand Juvenal, and, conſequently, can be no judge of the merits of the tranſlation. In the ſeventh chapter, devoted to modern languages, nothing occurs much worthy of either praiſe or cenſure.

Chapter the eighth is devoted to works of education. Miſs Hamilton's Letters are fairly and candidly reviewed. The admirable treatiſe of Dr. Barrow is introduced for the purpoſe of calling forth diſſenting notions on education. The Doctor is cenſured for being an enemy to new ſyſtems of tuition which ſuperſede the Bible and the Catechiſm. The Reviewer aſſerts that clergymen of the church are *idle, ignorant, and drunken*, and, therefore, that the only fit teachers are diſſenting miniſters. Not ſuch men as Vincent, Warton, Goodenough, Drury, and Raine, ought to be employed as teachers, but thoſe *men of all work*, who preach, open academies, and manufacture books; who from the pulpit declaim againſt biſhops and kings, from the preſs repeat often confuted attacks on the divinity of our Saviour, and from the deſk inſtruct youth in their *loyalty and religion*. Theſe are the teachers our Annual Reviewers would recommend, and we muſt admit that

none

none can be found fitter for forming critics, ſo *qualified and diſpoſed*, as the Annual Reviewers.

From a work, written by Mr. Kett, member of one of our Univerſities, our Reviewer *makes* an occaſion to abuſe both our national ſeminaries. Oxford and Cambridge, *are neſts of drones*. They are trees that yield no good fruit, and therefore ought to be caſt into the fire. A long detail endeavours to prove that ability and learning neither do nor can come from our national ſeminaries. From ſtigmatizing the Church and Univerſities, our Reviewer, with ſteady conſiſtency of deſign, proceeds to inveigh againſt men of literary eminence who have ſupported order and good government. Clarendon, the able and wiſe champion of the hierarchy and monarchy, according to the Annual Reviewers, deſerved no praiſe as an hiſtorian. Robertſon, the uniform ſupporter of order, religion, and virtue, is a meagre writer in the eſtimation of Mr. Arthur Aikin. We do not recollect that Oldmixon, the *book-maker*, was an admirer of Mr. Pope. Gibbon is highly praiſed. He was not ſimply an able hiſtorian, like Clarendon and Robertſon, he was beſides an *infidel*; as ſtaunch an adverſary to the divinity of our Saviour, as the Annual Reviewers themſelves.

The general biography, by Dr. Aikin, is of courſe praiſed, in a work of which his ſon is the editor. In another article, the Annual Reviewer informs us, that this *Dr. Aikin undertakes* to continue the plan of JOHNSON'S LIVES of the Poets, and that even the lives written by Samuel Johnſon are to have alterations from the *improving* pen of John Aikin. The next article of literary intelligence will probably be, that *Lamb* is about to continue SHAKESPEARE, and to *improve* Macbeth and Othello.

We ſhall not encroach further on our reader's patience by following in detail the remainder of this heavy and unintereſting production, malignant in object and deſign, but feeble in execution; as hoſtile to our church, our king, our conſtitution, and to ſocial order and happineſs, as the Analytical Review of revolutionizing memory, but far inferior to the ability and learning of that noxious performance. In ſome parts of this miſcellany, not connected with religion and government, there are a few able articles,

Apparent rari nantes in gurgite vaſto.

and theſe we have not failed to notice with the ſame impartiality as the reſt. But with much pleaſure we obſerve that neither genius nor erudition are proſtituted on the *peculiar doctrines* of the Annual Reviewer. The theological and political criticiſms, without exception, are as deficient in vigour of underſtanding, as in ſoundneſs of principle; in clearneſs, elegance, and force of compoſition, as in the ſentiment of loyalty, patriotiſm, and genuine Chriſtianity.

Every true lover of his king and country muſt reprobate and deteſt the ſpirit manifeſted in this Annual Review; but every diſcerning lover of his king and country muſt rejoice that the conduct of ſuch hoſtile attacks, the allotment of parts, and the ſelection of coadjutors, are entruſted to the ability and penetration of Mr. Editor Aikin.

Another volume has lately appeared, equally weak and ignorant, but ſtill more uniformly malignant. That performance we ſhall hereafter review.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Observations on the Remonstrance of the Reverend Peter O'Neil, Parish-Priest of Ballymacoda, in the County of Cork.

IT has happened in all the rebellions which have disgraced and afflicted Ireland, that the disaffected, though the aggressors, have endeavoured to criminate the loyal party, by accusing them of some excesses, which are unavoidable in civil discord, even by the most moderate, when they are stimulated to revenge by the destruction of their property, and the murder of persons who are endeared to them by the tenderest ties of consanguinity and friendship.

To effectuate this, and to fan the flame of rebellion, a great many gross libels have been written since the year 1798, and none of them have been published with a more malignant design, or have had a worse tendency, than the Remonstrance of Father Peter O'Neil, which appeared in most of the newspapers in Great Britain and Ireland. The main design of publishing it in England, where O'Neil could not be known, was to libel the government, and calumniate the Protestants of Ireland. The only object of these observations, is to expose its falsity, the evil views of the persons who framed and presented it to the public, and to defeat its dangerous effects.

Various gross libels, signed *Julius Vindex*, have appeared in the course of the last three years. In Mr. *Scully*'s Advice to his Brethren, the King's title was libelled, and his personal qualities were aspersed. It was ably answered in the Letters of a Yeoman, and in an edition of that work with copious notes, and an appendix, published by *John Millikin*, bookseller. The author seemed sensible of his error, as in a second edition, with a preface, he omitted many of the libellous passages which appeared in the first.

Mr. *Plowden*'s Historical Review, and his postliminious preface, abound with virulent invectives against the British government for 600 years past, and against some of the most illustrious statesmen, both living and dead. But he has been ably answered and exposed, in strictures on the former, published by *Rivington* in *London*, and *John Archer* in *Dublin*. The grossest libel that ever appeared in any civilized country, is a work, entitled, *History of the Insurrection of the County of Wexford*, A. D. 1798, by *Edward Hay*. It was printed and published by the noted *John Stockdale**, in whose house the supposed author lodged and boarded many months before the explosion on the 23d of *July* 1803; and it is universally believed, that it was intended as an incitement to the conspirators and actors concerned in that dreadful event.

From the illiterateness of its author, and the great variety of styles which appears in it, there cannot be a doubt but that it was composed by different persons, and that he had little or no concern in it.

It imputes the rebellion of 1798 to no other cause, than the tyranny and cruelty of government, and of the magistrates, whom he describes thus: "Slaves to their superiors, but *tyrants to their inferiors:* those needy adven-

* A printer, in Abbey-street, Dublin, who was imprisoned on treasonable charges in 1798, and again in July 1803, when he and Edward Hay were arrested and committed at the same time.

turers

turers became the prevailing tools of power. Juſtices of the Peace are ſelected from this claſs."—"Theſe creatures have therefore the effrontery to puſh themſelves forward on every occaſion, and after a ſeries of habitical *acts of turpitude*, whenever an opportunity preſents itſelf, they become *the ſcourges and firebrands* of the country."—*These wretches* have been ſet on to commit *flagrant acts of outrage*, to anſwer the political purpoſes of their patrons, who ſhrink from appearing perſonally concerned in *those deeds of ſhame*."

Mr. *Hay*, who was impriſoned many months at Wexford in 1798, for being concerned in the rebellion, petitioned the magiſtrates of that town to be allowed to tranſport himſelf to America*.

It is ſingular that he has eſcaped with impunity, after having publiſhed ſo inflammatory a libel, while many perſons of an inferior rank, whom it has probably incited to commit the moſt flagitious crimes, have ſuffered capitally.

It is univerſally allowed, that this is a party pamphlet, written by a number of the leading Roman Catholics in Dublin, for the expreſs purpoſe of palliating the enormities perpetrated by their ſectaries, and of calumniating the government and the Proteſtants, as it contains a tiſſue of the groſſeſt and moſt notorious falſhoods. Dr. Troy, titular archbiſhop of Dublin, libelled the reformation, in what he called an exhortation, publiſhed in all the Iriſh newſpapers, on the 10th of October 1803, a very unſeaſonable and inauſpicious moment. I ſhall not take upon me to ſay what the deſign of its author was, but it could not fail to make the eſtabliſhed church and its members hateful to the Popiſh multitude, whoſe diſaffection is already too notorious.

In this he tells us, that "the ſeditious doctrines of Wicliffe and Hus were condemned by the council of Conſtance."

It is ſurpriſing that he would have the aſſurance to mention that council, as it contains ſome of thoſe infamous doctrines of the Romiſh Church, which have ſpread anarchy, deſolation, and bloodſhed, in many European ſtates. It expreſsly ſays, that "no faith is to be kept with heretics."

But the Doctor has ſaid, in his paſtoral letter of 1793, that "the decrees of general councils are infallible in point of faith and morality, and not liable to deceit or error;" and the conſequences muſt be very obvious to thoſe who have peruſed them, as they contain the moſt peſtilent doctrines, which are repugnant to evangelical truth, and ſubverſive of moral and ſocial harmony.

It is the duty of every loyal ſubject to detect and expoſe the falſity, and to counteract the evil effects of ſuch peſtilent libels.

It will be impoſſible for the reader to form a juſt opinion of Father O'Neil's caſe, without knowing the woeful ſtate of Ireland, and particularly of Youghal and its vicinity, in the year 1798.

Many cold-blooded murders had been committed in that town, and its neighbourhood, in the courſe of a few weeks. An entire family was maſſacred in the night, with circumſtances of ſavage barbarity, within two miles of it, by a mob, conſiſting of five or ſix hundred of their neighbours, and merely on account of a groundleſs ſuſpicion, that the head of that family had made ſome diſcoveries of the treaſonable deſigns of the conſpira-

* He was diſcharged under the amneſty act at Wexford, in 1799.

tors,

tors. The magiſtrates were in poſſeſſion of the following evidence: That money had been levied on the maſs of the Roman Catholics there, to promote the object of the conſpiracy; that they had purchaſed an immenſe quantity of pikes, great numbers of which had been diſcovered and ſeized; that they had taken treaſonable oaths of aſſociation; and adding the guilt of perjury to treaſon, they alſo ſwore oaths of allegiance; that they meditated a general and ſudden riſing, and to have rioted in the blood of their Proteſtant fellow-ſubjects, which their fellow-traitors were actually doing, at that time, in the counties of Dublin, Meath, Kildare, Carlow, Wicklow, and Wexford. The garriſon, conſiſting of a portion of the Wexford regiment, and the Proteſtant yeomen of the town, were overcome and exhauſted from conſtant watching, as they were apprehenſive of being ſurpriſed and murdered in their beds, which had been recently the fate of ſome garriſons in the province of Leinſter. Their fears aroſe chiefly from the inhabitants of the pariſh of Ballymacoda, who were well known to be diſaffected and organized in a very high degree.

From the difficulty of diſcovering the inſtigators of thoſe barbarous murders, they had no hopes of being able to check their progreſs; but as it appeared, that on the eruption of the rebellion, the prieſts in the province of Leinſter were actively concerned in it, they had ſtrong reaſons for ſuſpecting that the Popiſh clergy in the neighbourhood were deeply concerned in theſe enormities. At laſt Thomas O'Neil of Ballydaniel, a farmer in very opulent circumſtances, and the neighbour and near relation of Father Peter O'Neil, was arreſted by Captain Archer of the Wexford regiment, on a charge of being concerned in the murder of one Reily, a ſoldier of the Meath regiment; and, on being queſtioned, he confeſſed that Reily had been condemned by a committee of aſſaſſination, conſiſting of thirteen or fifteen perſons, reſiding in the pariſh of Ballymacoda; that they took the ſentence to Father O'Neil, pariſh-prieſt thereof; that he approved of it, and that, after the murder had been committed, he gave abſolution to the aſſaſſins; which facts, with many others, are ſtated in the annexed affidavits*.

During the progreſs of the conſpiracy and rebellion, ſuch committees exiſted in every pariſh or barony, for the purpoſe of condemning to death ſuch perſons as endeavoured to check the treaſonable deſigns of the conſpirators, or aſſiſted in executing the law, and the ſentence ſeldom failed to be enforced; which occaſioned ſo many cold-blooded aſſaſſinations for three or four years previous to the rebellion.

Thomas O'Neil, who was afterwards hanged at Cork, confeſſed to his landlord, Sir Edward Hoare, that he had taken the following oath: "I do moſt ſolemnly ſwear, that I will pay no rent or tythes, that I will uſe my utmoſt endeavours to deſtroy all Proteſtants and falſe brothers†, and to be true to the French in caſe of their landing in Ireland;" and that he did preſide at the murder of Patrick Reily, a ſoldier of the Meath regiment, aſſaſſinated near Youghal, with a drawn ſword in his hand, and ordered his

---

* See Appendix, No. I.

† By falſe brothers he meant ſuch Roman Catholics as would not join cordially in the conſpiracy, for they were as hateful as Proteſtants, being conſidered as apoſtates from their religion.

body

body to be thrown into a deep hole in the ſea, near Ring, in ſaid pariſh of Ballymacoda.

An oath of the ſame tenor was univerſally taken by the United Iriſhmen; but when it was exhibited to any Proteſtant, who, as republicans, had entered into the conſpiracy, the word Proteſtant was omitted.

In an affidavit, ſworn before Lord Loftus, the 2d of June 1798, he confirmed many of the circumſtances relative to Reily's murder; and a ſhort time before his execution, he acknowledged to the officers of the guard, that Father Peter O'Neil had given abſolution for murder.

I ſhall not take upon me to defend, or even to excuſe, the practice of whipping perſons well known to be concerned in that dreadful conſpiracy, for the purpoſe of extorting evidence from them; though it was the means, with the aſſiſtance of Providence, of preſerving the conſtitution, and of ſaving the lives of many thouſand loyal perſons.

If it could admit of extenuation in any inſtance whatſoever, it would be in the caſe of Father O'Neil; for any perſon acquainted with the rules of evidence, uſually adopted in diſtributive juſtice, muſt perceive, that his guilt was proved in the moſt unequivocal manner, by the teſtimony of Thomas O'Neil; though in that moment of irritation and alarm, when martial law was proclaimed, a regular trial was not held.

Deſperate remedies, though repugnant to the ſpirit of the conſtitution, have been adopted to check the progreſs of deſperate evils. *Inter arma ſilent leges.* Common policy dictates that a part ſhould be ſacrificed to ſave the whole. London would have been depopulated by the plague, which raged there in 1665, but for the following expedient, to prevent the contagion from ſpreading: The infected were ſhut up in their houſes, and guards were placed at their doors to prevent ingreſs or egreſs; and they were left to periſh for want of medical aſſiſtance. An act, which, like whipping during the rebellion, muſt be regarded in the abſtract, and without conſidering the exiſting circumſtances, as cruel and inhuman!

It appears, not only from the annexed affidavits, made by perſons highly credible, and by the determination of a court of inquiry, but by moral evidence ariſing from Father O'Neil's own ſtatement in his remonſtrance, that no credit whatſoever is to be given to his aſſertions, and he exhibits no other proofs of his boaſted innocence, or of the facts ſet forth in it.

Some months after O'Neil's puniſhment, he prevailed on a gentleman of rank to preſent a memorial to the Marquis Cornwallis in his behalf. This memorial made ſome impreſſion on his Excellency, who is humane and merciful, and he ſent it to General Graham, then commanding at Youghal, and ordered him to inveſtigate the truth of its allegations. The General, after conferring with Major Ellis, an old experienced officer, who had acted there as Judge-Advocate, ordered a court of inquiry to be held for the above purpoſe, though it was evident to Major Ellis, and to the magiſtrates of the town, that O'Neil's memorial contained not only many ſcandalous falſhoods, but ſome phyſical impoſſibilities. The court of inquiry conſiſted of officers of the Lancaſhire Fencibles, commanded by the Earl of Wilton, and as they were perfect ſtrangers, there could not be a poſſibility that they could have had any local prejudices. Major Ellis, now living, officiated on the occaſion, as Judge-Advocate; the court ſat many days, and every perſon capable of throwing any light on the ſubject was called upon to give evidence, and did accordingly attend. The Judge-Advocate and the court, deſirous of giving Father O'Neil every poſſible advantage, and hoping that Father M'Guire,

M'Guire, pariſh-prieſt of Youghal, which is contiguous to Ballymacoda, could ſay ſomething favourable of him, ordered the ſaid prieſt to attend. M'Guire having arrived, he ſaid he would not have any communication with him, as he was a bad man, and a ſcandal to his profeſſion*. All the witneſſes were examined by the court, and the evidence for and againſt the priſoner was faithfully taken down, and ſigned by each of its members, without, in the ſmalleſt degree, giving any opinion of their own.

When the court had finiſhed their inveſtigation, General Graham ſent the whole of the proceedings to the Marquis Cornwallis, who expreſſed, in anſwer to the General, his ſatisfaction at the mode of inquiry, his conviction of his guilt, and his ſurpriſe that any gentleman of conſequence or reſpectability could apply to him in favour of ſuch a villain. This letter was ſeen by the Rev. Dr. Rogers of Youghal, and Major Ellis, the Judge-Advocate. It was proved before the court by perſons highly credible, that he acknowledged his guilt, not only during his puniſhment†, but afterwards. Captain Swayne has declared, that he confeſſed to him many months after, when he conducted him to Cove, that he deſerved the puniſhment which had been inflicted on him; and by the annexed affidavits it appears, that he did not deny his knowledge of the murder, and only ſaid, that whatever he knew of it he could not diſcloſe, as it was told him in confeſſion, but that he would impart it to his biſhop, Dr. Coppinger, or Prieſt M'Guire.

The charges againſt Father O'Neil were ſubſtantiated, and the allegagations contained in his memorial were proved to be falſe before the court of inquiry.

As his memorial contained, among many untruths and calumnies, the following groſs falſhood, which he admits, he endeavours to palliate it by a jeſuitical evaſion contained in his remonſtrance. In his memorial he ſtates, that he was whipt, thrown into a dungeon, and left without medical aſſiſtance. Mr. Benjamin Green, apothecary, was examined before the court of inquiry, and he declared, "that he attended him in leſs than two hours after he had been puniſhed, dreſſed his back, and gave him ſuch medicine as he deemed neceſſary; that he was confined in an airy, healthy, comfortable room, in the upper part of the goal, where he viſited him every day, and dreſſed his back, and adminiſtered every aſſiſtance he judged neceſſary, not only to preſerve his health, but likewiſe to heal his back."

Now to varniſh over this monſtrous falſhood, he ſays in his remonſtrance, "*with the proceedings of that court* (meaning the court of inquiry) *I am to this day unacquainted.* It was ordered, I know, in conſequence of a memorial upon my ſituation, handed to a diſtinguiſhed nobleman, and by him preſented to the caſtle; *I was not conſulted with regard to its contents. Unfortunately for me, it was penned with more zeal than accuracy:* ſetting forth, among other hardſhips, that, after my puniſhment, I had been left without medical aſſiſtance, (on the report, I preſume, of a ſiſter-in-law, who viſited me within the interval between the whipping and the apothecary's arrival.) It‡ further ſtated, that I had been whipped and thrown into a dungeon, inſtead of ſtating, as it ought to have done, that I had been thrown into a dungeon and whipt. This inverſion was fatal to me; for the evidence of Mr. Green, apothecary, *moſt plauſibly contradicted these alle-*

---

* See Appendix, No. II. and V. † See Appendix, No. II. and IV.

‡ The memorial was not framed till ſome time after, it muſt therefore have been maturely conſidered by Prieſt O'Neil himſelf.

gations

gations of the memorial; and that circumſtance, when coupled with the ſubſequent horrid charges, *audaciously forged and foisted into the minutes of the inquiry*, excited an almoſt invincible prejudice in the mind of the merciful Marquis Cornwallis againſt me." Now this explanation in his remonſtrance, contains as groſs an aberration from truth, as the ſtatement of the facts to which it refers in the memorial; for he never was put into a dungeon or a black hole. He endeavours to exculpate himſelf from the other miſrepreſentations, of which Mr. Greene's teſtimony convicts him, by imputing it to a miſtake made by his ſiſter-in-law; and to give a colour to this, he is driven to the neceſſity of aſſerting, what is ſo abſurd and improbable, that credulity itſelf recoils at and rejects it, viz. that he was totally ignorant of the contents of his memorial, not having been conſulted thereon, though his exculpation, and the regaining his liberty, depended on the impreſſion which it was likely to make on Marquis Cornwallis; and no perſon but himſelf could be acquainted with his ſufferings, which were minutely detailed in his memorial. Beſides, as all his relations were low obſcure people, and perfectly illiterate, it is not likely that he, the only perſon among them who had the ſmalleſt degree of learning, was not concerned in drawing it up. Is it to be ſuppoſed then, that he was not conſulted on the framing it?

He is guilty of another glaring inconſiſtency; for though he declares in his remonſtrance, "that with the proceedings of the court of inquiry he is to this day unacquainted," he impudently and falſely aſſerts, "that *horrid charges were audaciously forged and foisted into the minutes of it.*"

He ſays in his Remonſtrance, "that while the public condeſcend to indulge him with a hearing, he will confine himſelf to what is abſolutely neceſſary for his exculpation, and that to expreſs, or even harbour reſentment, would ill become him;" and yet he ſets forth in it the following exaggerated ſtatement of his ſufferings, of which the principal part is contradicted by the annexed affidavits, and every other perſon preſent at his puniſhment is ready to do ſo upon oath.

"That ſix ſoldiers ſtood ready for this operation, ſome of them right-handed, and ſome of them left-handed, two at a time*, and that to accelerate the ſhaking of the triangle, a wire cat was introduced, armed with ſcraps of tin or lead †, that horrid charges were audaciouſly forged and foiſted into the minutes of the court of inquiry; that in ſome wine and water, which were given to him after his puniſhment, *there was some powerful ingredient which speedily brought on a stupor*," inſinuating that it was medicated, and of a deleterious nature; "that he was confined in a loathſome receptacle of the barracks, called the Black Hole, rendered ſtill more offenſive by the ſtench of the common neceſſary, and that he remained there from Friday until Monday;" which fact is notoriouſly falſe, and can be diſproved by the teſtimony of Dr. Jackſon, M. D. Mr. Benjamin Greene, apothecary, and many other perſons who were preſent; he alſo aſſerts in his Remonſtrance, that an officer went to him the day after he was whipped, and made uſe of the following threats: "that he ſhould be flogged as before, ſhot, hanged, his head cut off, to be expoſed on the jail top, and his body thrown into the river." Though he tells us that this was done, in order to extort from him an avowal of his guilt, he afterwards inſinuates, that it was to *get money from*

---

* He was whipt by two drummers, and only one at a time.

† See Appendix, No. III. and IV.

him,

him, or a favourite mare. Here he is guilty of a groſs inconſiſtency, for he aſcribes two motives to the ſame perſon; and as he had previouſly acknowledged his guilt, in a paper ſigned by himſelf, and never denied that he was privy to the murder, it is not probable that this officer would have recourſe to ſuch menaces to make him confirm it.

He poſitively confeſſed to Dr. Rogers and others, who proved it before the court of enquiry, that he was privy to, and ſanctioned murder, and even mentioned the names of ſome of the perpetrators, which coincided with Thomas O'Neil's affidavit; and he even added, that he was impelled by fear to do ſo, and to take oaths tendered to him by the United Iriſhmen.

The reader muſt be convinced, that this high coloured picture of his ſufferings was for no other purpoſe but to calumniate the Proteſtants, and to inflame the Popiſh multitude; and it is well known, that the diſaffected, and the Popiſh clergy in particular, uſed every expedient which malice could deviſe, for that purpoſe, previous to, and during the rebellion of 1798. He, in various parts of his Remonſtrance, ſpeaks of ſeveral proofs of his innocence, *that he was acquitted in the eyes of government,* &c. and that, therefore, his ſentence of tranſportation was remitted; but this was by no means the caſe, for his Excellency did not order a ſuſpenſion of his ſentence, till above two years after his puniſhment; and, in the mean time, he had been importuned by perſons of high conſideration; but no proof whatever appeared of his innocence, but his own declarations in his memorial and ſome affidavits made by ſome of the lower claſs of Iriſh, to whom no credit ſhould be given. The facts ſet forth in the memorial were proved to be unfounded before the court of enquiry; and the falſity of his remonſtrance is evinced, not only by the annexed affidavits, but by moral evidence contained in his own ſtatement. What credit then can be given to any of his aſſertions? Delinquents, guilty of high treaſon, in the rebellion of 1798, were ſo numerous, that the executive power was induced by motives of political neceſſity to pardon multitudes of traitors; and, from the impoſſibility of enforcing the law againſt them, they did not arreſt a tenth part of thoſe who were well known to be highly criminal. In popular governments, men of fortune, who have any political intereſt to maintain, will be conſtantly importuned by their adherents, and cannot reſiſt their ſolicitation, to procure the pardon of delinquents.

Lord Clarendon, Viceroy of Ireland in the reign of James II. complained much of this in his ſtate letters. As the puniſhment of a few culprits in each diſtrict, out of the immenſe numbers that were guilty, anſwered the purpoſe of example, Marquis Cornwallis had an ample opportunity of gratifying his merciful diſpoſition, and, at the ſame time, of complying with the interceſſion of perſons in power and influence, who ſolicited the remiſſion or extenuation of puniſhment, In conſequence of repeated application, his Excellency was pleaſed to order, that Father O'Neil ſhould not be tranſported in the veſſel deſtined for Botany Bay, but that he ſhould be confined in priſon until further orders; which was by no means a pardon, as is falſely aſſerted in his remonſtrance, but a ſuſpenſion of his ſentence. This order was dated the 20th of June, 1800, which was a period of two years after his committal and puniſhment; and it is well known, that, during that ſpace, repeated applications had been made for his pardon by ſome exalted perſonages, though government had not received any ſubſequent proofs tending to exculpate him. Father O'Neil aſſerts, then, what is untrue, *Lord Cornwallis, whoſe diſcernment perceived, and whoſe generoſity recoiled at,*

this

this queſtionable proceeding, unheſitatingly iſſued an order for his removal from the tranſport; for he reſiſted repeated applications in his behalf during two years.

He ſays, "my Lords and Gentlemen, I am now liberated; not through a pardon ſolicited for, or granted me, but on the merits of my caſe; I now moſt ſolemnly ſwear, in the preſence of Almighty God, upon his holy goſpels, firſt, that I never was an United Iriſhman; that I never took an oath; that I never encouraged, adviſed, or permitted others to take it; ſome of whom have had the generoſity to make affidavit* of my exertions in this behalf; and there are thoſe who have candidly added, that they would have taken it, had I not prevented them." But after the groſs perjuries committed by the Popiſh prieſts, and their entire flocks, during the progreſs of the conſpiracy and rebellion, what regard is to be given to their ſolemn appeals to the Almighty, particularly as abſolution was frequently given, by the Popiſh clergy, for the moſt horrid crimes.

The applications which had been ſo often made to Lord Cornwallis in his behalf, were renewed to the preſent government, who went one ſtep farther than his Lordſhip; for, without any proof whatſoever of his innocence, but the Marquiſs's letter for ſuſpending his ſentence, they were pleaſed to permit him to return to his native country; and his falſe and inflammatory publication, under the title of a Remonſtrance, ſhews how little gratitude he felt for their lenity.

The clemency of government, in pardoning perſons concerned in the rebellion of 1798, or in mitigating their puniſhment, was no proof whatſoever of their innocence.

Father Kennedy, pariſh prieſt of Caſtle Otway; Father Meara, pariſh prieſt of Nenag; Father O'Brian, pariſh prieſt of Doone, all in the county of Tipperary, were concerned in the conſpiracy; and yet they were pardoned, the two laſt after they had been ſentenced to tranſportation. Kennedy acknowledged that he had been ſworn by Meary. Father Harold, pariſh prieſt of Rathcoole, in the county of Dublin, made all his pariſhioners ſwear oaths of allegiance, and he frequently pronounced loyal exhortations from the altar. On Sunday, preceding the eruption of the rebellion in 1798, he preached two impreſſive ſermons, inciting his flock to loyalty, in the preſence of Captain Ormſby,* and Lieutenant Chriſtopher Clinch, of the Rathcoole yeomen, and yet it appeared afterwards, that he had ſecretly perſuaded his flock to ſwear the treaſonable oath of the United Iriſhmen, and that he had been privy to, and aiding in, a conſpiracy formed by the Popiſh members of that corps, to murder all its Proteſtant members. John Clinch, a Papiſt, and ſecond lieutenant of the corps, was hanged, for having been concerned in that aſſaſſination plot; and, previous to his execution, he acknowledged the juſtice of his ſentence, and loaded Father Harold with execrations, for having inſtigated him, and the people of Rathcoole and its vicinity, to ſwerve from their fidelity, and violate their oath of allegiance. On the diſcovery of the plot, Father Harold fled; but having been afterwards apprehended, the alternative was offered him, of being tried or tranſported to Botany Bay, and he accepted the latter. He raiſed

---

* The lower claſs of people think ſo little of an oath, and committed perjury ſo often, that no regard ſhould be given to what they would ſwear.

* Now a repreſentative in parliament for the borough of Carlow.

another rebellion in Botany Bay. Had he had as powerful interceſſors as Father O'Neil, he would probably have returned, and have given a deſcription of the cruelty and perſecution which he ſuffered, in a *remonſtrance* ſimilar to Father O'Neil's. Though Father Travers, pariſh prieſt of Baltinglaſs, in the county of Wicklow, was noted for preaching loyal ſermons ſome months previous to the rebellion of 1798, he was convicted of being ſingularly active, and deeply concerned in fomenting it, both within and without his pariſh; and yet he was pardoned.

I could adduce many ſimilar caſes, but that they would ſwell theſe obſervations to too great a bulk. Many members of the Back-lane parliament, ſummoned by Edward Byrne in 1792, were deeply concerned in the conſpiracy or rebellion, and now enjoy their liberty under a pardon of the amneſty act.

We cannot be ſurprized at this conduct of the Romiſh prieſts, as it is in ſtrict conformity to their canonical oath, and the decrees of their general councils, which Mr. Francis Plowden, in his caſe, ſtated, and Dr. Troy, titular Archbiſhop of Dublin, in his Paſtoral Letter, tells us, are infallible in point of faith and morality, and not liable to deceit or error; a doctrine which ſhakes the foundation of civil ſociety!

As abſolution for crimes, how enormous ſoever, is, and has been, a common practice in the Romiſh church, can we be ſurprized that it ſhould have been uſed by the Popiſh prieſts in the progreſs of a conſpiracy, formed for the proſtration of hereſy, and for the advancement of their own religion, which they conſider the only true and holy one? How often has the Pope granted plenary indulgence, and a full remiſſion of ſins, to his ſectaries in England and Ireland, as a conſideration for renouncing their allegiance, and riſing in arms againſt an heretical ſtate? Pius V. did ſo in Elizabeth's reign, and Urban VIII. in 1643, and during the progreſs of the Iriſh rebellion, iſſued a bull for the purpoſe of fomenting it, in which he granted a general abſolution from their ſins to all the members of his church, who ſhould join in the extirpation of heretics; which encouraged the perpetration of murder. The reader will find in Sir Richard Muſgrave's Hiſtory, the following inſtances of abſolution granted for crimes committed in 1798.

Thomas Cleary was hanged at Wexford, the 8th of March, 1800, for the murder of his maſter, Edward Turner, Eſq. and three magiſtrates, James Boyd, Chriſtopher Wilſon, and William Turner, Eſqrs. atteſted and ſubſcribed his confeſſion, that he had obtained abſolution from two prieſts of the names of Murphy and Ryan.* James Beagan, executed on Vinegar-hill, the 24th of Auguſt, 1799, for various murders, declared, in the preſence of the High Sheriff, and J. H. Lyſter, Eſq. a magiſtrate, that he never would have been guilty of murder, but for the prieſts: and his confeſſion was atteſted and publiſhed by theſe gentlemen.†

Dr. Caulfield, titular biſhop of Ferms, in a letter to Bryan Murphy, a prieſt, dated the 19th of March, 1800, tells him, that (being under a ſuſpenſion) he had not power to adminiſter ſacraments, or to *give abſolution for ſins*, for want of a power or faculty for that purpoſe; and he tells him, "*that he gives the unfortunate penitents abſolution, which he had no power to do, leaving the unhappy ſinners in their ſins, and leading them to perdition.*‡

---

* Appendix, xx, 22. † Ibid. xix. 8. ‡ Ibid. xx. 23.

Father

Father Byrne, a Wexford prieſt, in a letter to Mr. Robert Donovan, an eminent attorney of Peter-ſtreet, Dublin, dated 30th of Auguſt, 1799, ſays of his biſhop, Dr. Caulfield, "inſtead of excommunicating the barbarous murderers of Scullabogue, he gave all his prieſts power to give abſolution for murder; a power which he ever till then reſerved to himſelf.* It is a common practice in the Romiſh church, for the Pope and the biſhops to limit the common prieſts, in abſolving from murder, and other crimes of a deep dye, which they call *reſerved caſes*. Thus, in the bull which Pope Urban VIII. iſſued in 1643, to encourage the Iriſh rebellion, he permits the prieſts to forgive—all ſins, crimes, and delinquencies, how heinous and atrocious ſoever they be, *not omitting thoſe very enormities, in the moſt peculiar caſes, which were deſigned to be reſerved to the ordinary and the apoſtolic See.*"

Strada, a learned Jeſuit, who wrote the Hiſtory of the Civil Wars in Flanders, tells us in it, that Jaurigny, one of the aſſaſſins of William I. Prince of Orange, "expatiated the guilt of that crime, before its perpetration, by receiving the ſacrament from a Dominican friar.† In ſhort, all the parricides of that day, who committed murders on the ſcore of religion, and to extirpate hereſy, ſuch as Clement the Dominican, who aſſaſſinated Henry III. of France, Chatel and Ravillac went to confeſſion before they committed thoſe crimes.

Thuanus, a Roman Catholic writer, tells us, in his very excellent hiſtory, that the Pope, "in a long premeditated ſpeech, applauded the virtue and firmneſs of the holy friar Clement, the murderer of his ſovereign, declared that his fervent zeal towards God ſurpaſſed that of Judith and Eleazar, and that this aſſaſſination was brought about by Divine Providence."

The ſame hiſtorian tells us, that Balthazar Gerard, one of the aſſaſſins of William I. the Stadtholder, confeſſed that he was aſſured by ſome jeſuits, that he would enjoy eternal happineſs, and be enrolled among the beſt of martyrs, if he murdered that prince.

William Parry, a Roman Catholic gentleman, at the inſtance of Palmio a jeſuit, and Campeggio, the Pope's Nuncio conſulted and undertook to murder Queen Elizabeth, and for that purpoſe he obtained the Pope's abſolution through Cardinal Como; but, having been diſcovered and apprehended, he confeſſed the whole plot, and his evidence was confirmed by Como's letter, which was found upon him. Such are the horrid and deteſtable principles which have diſgraced Ireland for theſe 25 years paſt, and by which England was agitated, while the ſectaries of the Romiſh church were numerous in it! And yet it is melancholy to think, that the malignant efforts of perſons employed to miſrepreſent the ſtate of Ireland, and to calumniate the Proteſtants thereof, have been ſo ſucceſsful in England, as to make the inhabitants of the latter believe, that the diſturbances in the former ariſe from oppreſſion and the privation of civil rights. Fatal deluſion, that may in time ſhake the empire to its baſe!

---

* See this letter at large, in Sir Richard Muſgrave's Hiſtory, Appendix, xxi. 9.

† Non ante facinus aggredi ſuſtinuit, quam expiatam ejus animam, apud dominchanum ſacerdotem, cœleſti pane confirmaverat.

APPENDIX.

No. I.

County of Tyrone, to wit. } HENRY ARCHER, captain in the Wexford militia, came before me, one of his Majeſty's juſtices of the peace for the county of Tyrone, this day, and made oath on the Holy Evangeliſts, that in the month of May 1798, he was a ſubaltern officer in the Wexford regiment, and quartered at Ballymacoda in the county of Cork; that he received information againſt a man of the name of O'Neil, reſiding near the village of Ballymacoda, of his being concerned in the murder of a man near ſaid place, being a ſoldier as deponent believes, in the Meath regiment of militia; that on deponent's apprehending him, he (O'Neil) on being promiſed his liberty, if he gave ſome good information concerning the murderers, informed deponent that Peter O'Neil, pariſh prieſt of Ballymacoda, was concerned in, and knew of the ſaid murder having been committed; that a committee, conſiſting of either thirteen or fifteen men, reſiding in and about the village, aſſembled; that it was there determined the ſoldier ſhould be put to death; that the committee then took the ſentence of the court to ſaid Peter O'Neil, who approved of it, and after the murder was committed on the body of the ſoldier, gave them all abſolution; on which information deponent took up prieſt O'Neil, and brought him immediately (with O'Neil before apprehended) into Youghal; deponent believes that O'Neil (not the prieſt) on giving bail was liberated, but has heard and believes, that he was afterwards taken up by Lord Boyle on different charges, and hanged at Cork.

Sworn before me at Aughnacloy, April 14, 1804.

Henry Archer. THO. FORESYTH.

No. II.

County of Tyrone, to wit. } JOSEPH MEKINSON, ſergeant-major of the Wexford regiment, came before me one of his Majeſty's juſtices of the peace for the county of Tyrone, this day, and made oath on the Holy Evangeliſts, that he was preſent at the flogging of prieſt O'Neil at Youghal, the latter end of May or beginning of June 1798; that the prieſt being aſked at the triangles by Lord Loftus, if he knew any thing of the murder of the ſoldier belonging to the Meath regiment? replied, that whatever he knew was told him at confeſſion, and of courſe could not be divulged; that on being flogged for ſome time, he ſaid, that if his biſhop Coppinger was there he would tell all to him, on which the biſhop was ſent for but could not be found; that he then ſaid he would confeſs to a prieſt in town, named M'Guire; deponent was then ſent by the commanding officer for father M'Guire, who begged not to be brought in ſight of prieſt O'Neil, as he knew him to be a very bad man. Being aſked by Lord Loftus, if he thought O'Neil was bound to conceal his knowledge of any murder, although revealed to him at confeſſion? he replied, that it was by no means obligatory on him to conceal murder. On father O'Neil's being flogged ſtill, he confeſſed that he himſelf had choſen the committee, and had ſigned the *death-warrant* of the ſoldier, and that he deſerved the puniſhment he had received, as he looked upon himſelf to be the real *murderer*.

Sworn before me at Aughacloy, April 24, 1804.

Joſeph Mekinſon. THO. FORESYTH.

No. III.

No. III.

County of Tyrone, to wit. } WILLIAM MERKLEY, drummer in the Wexford regiment of militia, came before me, one of his Majesty's juſtices of the peace for the county of Tyrone, this day, and made oath on the Holy Evangeliſts, that he remembers the flogging of prieſt O'Neil in Youghal, in May or June 1798, that he himſelf was one of thoſe who flogged him; that after receiving (as he thinks) about 300 laſhes at different periods, he heard him confeſs to Lord Loftus, that he had ſigned the death warrant of a ſoldier who had been murdered ſome time before. Deponent further ſwears, that there was no wire twiſted in the cats with which the prieſt was flogged, but that they were the ſame as were always uſed in the regiment.

Sworn before me at Aughnacloy,
April 14, 1804.

his
William × *Merkley*,
mark.

THO. FORESYTH.

No. IV.

County of Tyrone, to wit. } VALENTINE LOFTUS, private in the Wexford regiment of militia, came before me, one of his Majeſty's juſtices of the peace for the county of Tyrone, this day, and maketh oath on the Holy Evangeliſts, that he was preſent at the flogging of prieſt O'Neil in Youghal, and that being then a drummer, was one of them who flogged him; that he heard prieſt O'Neil confeſs before he was taken down from the triangles, that he had ſigned the *death warrant* of a ſoldier who had been murdered ſome time before. Deponent further ſwears, that the cats with which the prieſt was flogged, were the ſame as were always uſed in the regiment.

Sworn before me at Aughnacloy, April 14, 1804.

Valentine Loftus.

THO. FORESYTH.

No. V.

County of Tyrone, to wit. } THOMAS CUMMINS, drum-major of the Wexford regiment, ſweareth, that he remembers the flogging of prieſt O'Neil in the town of Youghal, in the latter end of May or beginning of June 1798, that after being tied up, and receiving about 50 laſhes, Lord Loftus aſked him, whether he would confeſs any knowledge of the murder of a ſoldier, as deponent believes, of the Meath regiment of militia? if he would, the remainder of his puniſhment ſhould be remitted; he the prieſt anſwered, that it was told to him in confeſſion, and that he could not divulge it; on which the puniſhment went on. He then ſaid, that if biſhop Coppinger was ſent for, he could tell it to him; that the biſhop was ſent for, but could not be found*; on which the prieſt ſaid, that if father John M'Guire, pariſh prieſt of Youghal, was ſent for he would tell him; that M'Guire came, and ſeemed greatly agitated on ſeeing the prieſt tied up, and aſked Lord Loftus if he had any thing againſt him? that Lord Loftus anſwered, he had not, and that he merely wanted him to take O'Neil's confeſſion; that M'Guire requeſted not to be forced to have any communication with him, as he was a bad man, and a ſcandal

* He fled from Youghal when the plot was diſcovered, and has not reſided there ever ſince.

to the profeſſion he belonged to; Lord Loftus then aſked him (M'Guire) whether it was the duty of his religion to conceal murder, though revealed to him in confeſſion? he anſwered, it was not, and that none but a bad man would conceal it; on which he was permitted to retire; that the puniſhment commenced again, and in a ſhort time the prieſt ſaid, that if he was let down he would confeſs; that deponent then heard him acknowledge, that he had ſigned the *death warrant* of the ſoldier who was murdered, on which he was let down. Deponent further ſwears, that there was no wire or tin in the cats with which the prieſt was flogged, but that they were the ſame as are uſed in the regiment.

Sworn before me at Aughnacloy, April 10, 1804.

Thomas Cummins. THO. FORESYTH.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR,

IN conſequence of your commendation of Mrs. Creſpigny's Letter to her Son, I put that publication into the hands of ſuch of my children as were old enough to be benefited by it While they were peruſing it with much attention, and, apparently, with conſiderable advantage, it was reported, and generally believed, that at an entertainment given by Mrs. C. at her huſband's beautiful villa at Camberwell, ſhe received a lady who has long lived, and ſtill continued to live, in *open adultery* with a married man. Scarcely was this circumſtance known in my family, when I perceived that Mrs. C.'s publication loſt its effect on the minds of my children. One morning, my eldeſt daughter, ſeeing the book upon the table, aſked me, with great ſimplicity, whether her mama would on any account ſuffer herſelf to be viſited by a woman who had loſt her character. I replied (of courſe) certainly not; for no woman of reputation, who had any reſpect for virtue, or, indeed, for herſelf, would aſſociate with a female whoſe character had been tarniſhed. My daughter then inquired whether rank and connection made any differeuce in ſuch a caſe. I replied that the rules of virtue were the ſame in all ſituations of life, and could not admit of any exception; that a female of high rank who tranſgreſſed thoſe rules was quite as infamous, as one of meaner ſtation, and abundantly more miſchievous, on account of the greater influence of her example; and that therefore thoſe women who make an exception in favour of ſuch a female, by admitting her into their ſociety, prove their regard for virtue to be counterfeit, and in reality fix as deep a ſtain upon their own characters as they would do by aſſociating with the loweſt proſtitute.

I exceedingly lament, Sir, that the uſefulneſs of Mrs. C.'s Letters, in my family, ſhould be diminiſhed by her conduct on the above occaſion; the work, indeed, is not in itſelf, leſs excellent on that account, but unleſs moral preceptors enforce by their example the principles they inculcate, their leſſons, however judicious and ſalutary, cannot be expected to produce much effect upon beings who are far more diſpoſed to be led by example even when good, and much more ſo when pernicious, than to liſten to admonition and advice.

I am, Sir,

Your conſtant reader,

A LOVER OF CONSISTENCY.

INDEX.

INDEX.

ACTING, new criterion of judgment on, 199.

Addington, Mr. the aſſertion that he was not in favour with his Majeſty refuted, 297.

Adverti ſements, ſpecimens of ſome iſſued by the candidates at the late election for Middleſex, 441.

Africans, and other inhabitants of the torrid zone inferior to thoſe of temperate climates, and why, 47.

Alps, remarks on their ſublime wonders, 19.

America, conjectures on its original population, 270.

Annual Review, ſerious accuſations againſt its editor, and ſtrictures on the general management of that work, 215,-219.

Annual Reviewers, ſtriking inſtances of their ignorance, malice, and bad principles, 107-109.

Apologues, or Fables, remarks on their origin, 472.

Articles of the Church, not to be Calviniſtically interpreted, 180.

———, thoſe of Lambeth quoted, 357—Remarks on them, 358.

Aſia, ſcanty knowledge of it poſſeſſed by the ancients, and ſketch of the progreſs of different travellers in the earlier ages, 161.

——, new reaſon why it was firſt inhabited, 407.

Aſiatics, on an ancient connection between them and the Celts, 458.

Aſtrology, project for the revival of that ſcience, 406

Aſtronomy of the Hindoos proved to be of no remote antiquity, 270.

Augereau, inſtance of his ferocity and cruelty at Venice, 194.

Auſtin, St. definition of his doctrine, 181.

Auſtria, its power and reſources, 16.

Authors, account of ſeveral who flouriſhed in the 13th century, 232.

Barras, account of his ſcandalous intrigues with the Venetian ambaſſador, previous to the fall of that republic, 192.

Battles, remarks on thoſe of the ancients, 22-25—on the moſt celebrated ſince the invention of gun-powder, 26-30.

Beattie, the late Dr. biographical account of, 383

Bedford, the late Duke of, defence of, Mr. Bowles's attack upon him, 309-315.

Bluſhing, conſidered unfaſhionable, and the beſt means of deſtroying that propenſity, 210.

Book, one the production of a German, deemed worthy of a dedication to God, 403.

Britain, ſketch of its political ſtate in 1792, 243—in 1795, 248.

Buffon, ſome account of, and his writings, 452.

Burdett, Sir F. charged with being a member of the Correſponding Society, &c. 390.

Burke, Mr. remarks on the verification of his predictions, 223—Lord Hamilton's remarks on his character and talents, 298.

Buonaparte, his attempts to bribe the newſpaper proprietors in 1802 expreſſed, 60.

———, ſummary of his proceedings in the Venetian territory, 192.

———, his anſwer to the deputies from the Venetian ſenate, previous to the ſubverſion of that government, 196.

———, admiſſion of his great military talents, 249.

———, ſome new anecdotes of him, 286.

———, conjectures on his religious opinions, 291—his avowed intentions with reſpect to Holland and Switzerland, 292.

Calviniſm, farther remarks on, 353.

Calviniſts and Arminians, remarks on the controverſy between them, 333—the nature of their prejudices explained, 335.

Camelford, Lord, doubts as to his religious principles, 214.

Cape of Good Hope, its importance as a reſidence for ſick Europeans, on their paſſage to India, 145.

——, remarks on the policy of making it a free port, &c. 146—on its importance to Britain, 151.

——, ſtatiſtical ſketch of it, 149.

——, its advantages to Great Britain, 64.

Catherine II. of Ruſſia, her advice to Paul I. relative to his conduct towards the French, 483.

Catholics, ſend a miſſion in 1802 to Buonaparte, to urge him to renew the war, 323—proofs of the diſſimulation of their clergy, 325.

———, ſpecimens of their loyalty and allegiance, 420-436.

Celtæ, remarks on their origin, and on the partiality of inquirers into it, 456.

Celtic Language, remarks on its progreſs in eaſtern countries, 459.

Ceylon, account of the natives of that iſland, their caſts, &c. 122.

Chapels, faſhionable account of, and the kind of ſervice performed in them, 228.

Chancellor of Ireland, defence of his conduct in the late correspondence with Lord Fingal. 419 436.
Chaucer, supposed period of his birth, 228 — conjectures respecting his age, on the production of his different poems, 229, 230.
———, some account of the early editions of his works 239, 340.
China, suspicious as to the antiquity of its great wall, 164.
Chivalry, advantages of its institutions, 239.
Christ, the only meritorious case of man's salvation, 30.
Christian Observer, heretical opinions of that work exposed, 33.
Christianity, its slow progress at the Cape of Good Hope, 65.
Circassians, account of their manners, &c. 162.
Classics, Latin, their literal interpretation condemned, 369.
Columbo, account of, the manners of its inhabitants, 118.
Commons, the former, Houses of, remarks on their infringement on the privileges of the constitution, 303.
Conceit, French, its hardihood, 454.
Confession, auricular, remarks on, 234.
Conjugal Affection, novel, reason for it in a man, 405.
Conjurors, veneration of, and confidence in their predictions by the natives of India, 115-117.
Cruelty to animals, reason of, in children, 277.
Cosmogony, new system of, 404.
Courts of Love, of the 12th century, account of those singular institutions, 340.
Dancing, the modern method of, a contamination of virgin purity, 210.
Dante, account of that poet, 340
Darwin, Dr. ludicrous animadversion on his theories, 391-396.
Daubeny, Mr. his refutation of the strictures on him by Overton, 175.
Delicacy, remarks on false and real, 280.
Denmark, account of its population, &c. 18.
Dress, present state of, amongst the French, 58.
——, description of the indecent mode of, among the French females, 280.
——, and manners of persons of fashion, strictures on, 211.
Duelling, striking comments on that horrid practice, 207.
Dutch, their ungrateful conduct of the English after the conquest of the Cape, 67.
———, in the interior of South Africa, Mr. Barrow's account of them, 143.
———, their designs in taking possession of the Cape, 145.
——— novel instance of their barbarity and infamy, 119.
Dutch peasantry at the Cape, their inhuman conduct towards their cattle, 62— the extortion and avarice of their women, ibid.
Earth, the process by which it became a manufactory for organized beings, 408.
Edinburgh Review, its character, 483.
Education, causes of its neglect in France, 281.
Encyclopædia, proper meaning of that word, and how abused by book-makers, 487.
Egyptians, Warburton's account of their mysteries, 132.
———, their opinion of the British soldiery, 253.
———, the assertion of Volney, that they descended from negroes, refuted, 274.
Elephants, manner of catching in Ceylon, 123.
Emigrants, the French instances of noble traits in their character, 283.
English and French manners, sketches of, 18.
English, their curious conduct to the Dutch on the conquest of the Cape, 67.
Englishmen, reasons for their determination to resist invasion, 293.
Engraving, censures on the present mechanical way of performing that art, 185.
Errors, in books, singular method of correcting them in Germany, 139.
Fables, remarks on their origin, &c. 472.
Faith, difference between that of a Church of England man and a Calvinist, 174.
Fame, lamentations on her capriciousness, 348.
Fever, on the resemblance between that disease in the East and West Indies, 387.
Finance, Mr. Chalmers's opinions on, refuted by M'Arthur, 77-80.
Fingal, Lord, remarks on his Correspondence with Lord Redesdale, 419-430.
Fox, Mr. his exclusion from the ministry shewn to have been at the strict command of his Majesty, 301.
Frederic the Great, instance of his want of humanity, 474—on his satirical writing, 475.
French, their national character, as it relates warlike operations, 478.
———, ludicrous eulogium on their virtues. 171.
———, their outrages on the fall of Venice, 197.
———, their incongrous mixture of finery and filth, 279.
———, at Acre, further proof of their having been poisoned by order of Buonaparte, 388.
———, vanity a predominant feature in their character, and its consequences, 95.
———, modern picture of their state, 283.
French swindler, curious anecdote of one, 51.
French and English manners, sketches of, 15.

Friendſhip, reflections on the loſs of, after a long duration, 349.
Gauls, utility of the thickneſs of their ſkulls in ancient times, 457.
Geography, ancient, importance of its ſtudy amongſt youth, 106.
Geometricians, new information for, 405.
German prolixity, in literature, ſingular inſtance of, 139.
Germans, remarks on their progreſs in literature ſince the reformation, 1.
Godwin, Mr. obſervations on his talents and attainments, 221—object of his Life of Chaucer, 224.
———, his juſt remarks on abſtract conſiderations of political affairs, 347.
Gower, the author of "De Confeſſione Amantis," his character vindicated, 346.
Grace, in what light conſidered by the Calviniſts, 494.
Gravity, novel way of deſcribing it, 405.
Greek and Latin languages, critical remarks on their pronunciation, 183.
Greek Teſtament, on the principal printed editions of it, 140.
Guinea-worm, that diſeaſe ſuppoſed to be communicated by contagion, 388.
Grenville party, deſcription of, by a writer in proſe of the late adminiſtration, 94.
Gun-boats, the French, on the neceſſity of exterminating them, 388.
Harlots, not to be conſecrated by the embraces of royalty, 399.
Hemſterhuis, Tiberius, biographical account of, 476.
Hindoos, Dr. Robertſon's arguments in favour of their claims to literature and ſcience diſputed, 268.
———, the alleged antiquity of the aſtronomy proved to be groundleſs, 270.
Homer, remarks on the origin of his poem the Iliad, 265.
Honey-bird of India, account of, 129.
Honour, its laws, which govern people of faſhion, defined, 206.
Horſe, origin of the diſeaſes of that animal, 278.
Hottentots, their character, and oppreſſive conduct of the Dutch towards them, 62.
Japan, ſurpriſing population of that country, 167.
Jedo, the capital of Japan, its extraordinary circumference, 167.
Jeſuits, cauſes which led to their baniſhment from Portugal, 475.
Jews, ſome new and general claims made by thoſe people, 467.
Iceland, its former eminent ſucceſs in literature, 18.
Ichneumon, account of that curious animal, 125.
Indians, ſketch of their manners, penances, puniſhments, &c. 117.
India Company, the Britiſh, their averſion from the population of Chriſtianity, 65.
Informers, refutation of the charge, that a body of them were kept by the Society for the Suppreſſion of Vice, 73.
———, common, inſtances of their utility, 74.
Ireland, the depraved ſtate of its inhabitants urged in juſtification of the correſpondence between Lords Fingall and Redeſdale, 316.
Juries, ſtriking remarks on the defects of trials by them, 159.
——, ſtrictures on their frequent want of common ſenſe, 208.
Juſtification by Faith, proper definition of it, 255, 256—conditions of juſtification, 257—conſequences of it, 262.
Kant, ſome account of, and the nature of his philoſophy, 488.
King of Candy, deſcription of his territory, 120.
King of Portugal, account of the attempt on his life in 1750, 475.
Lambeth articles quoted, 357.
Language, the ancient Engliſh, as uſed by Chaucer, not difficult to be underſtood, 341.
Latin and Greek terminations, critical remarks on their pronunciation, 183.
Law of honour, the modern defined, 206.
Laws, curious, relative to matrimony at the Cape of Good Hope, 64.
Liberty, in what caſe it may be inferior to ſlavery, 450.
Literature, Auſtrian, account of, 16—ſee alſo Germans.
Literature of France, its early ſtate, and origin of the Gens de Lettres, 449.
Living, ſketch of the ſtyle of, in England, during the 13th century, 240.
Locke, Mr. his obſervations on the intolerant ſpirit of Popery, 329.
London, remarks on its progreſſive enlargement, 470.
Louis XVIII. his expulſion from Venice demanded by the Directory in 1796, 190.
Malay ſlaves, their character, 65.
Manners and dreſs, remarks on thoſe of people of faſhion, 211.
Mannucci, the three, of Venice, (celebrated printers,) account of, and their works, 460-465.
Marcion and his followers, their wilful corruption of the New Teſtament, 134.
Marriage, preliminaries to, amongſt the Dutch at the Cape of Good Hope, 64.
May-day, account of that ancient ceremonial, 238.
Methodiſm, cauſes of its increaſe, 156.
Methodiſts, their manner of arguing on ſcriptural topics, 155.
Michaelis's Introduction to the New Teſtament,

ment, account of its plan, 2—obſervations on Mr. Margh's tranſlation of that work, 3-8.
Middleſex Election, reflections on that event, 439— ts hiſtory, 440.
Miniſters, the choice of, not inveſted in Lords, Commons, or people, 299.
Money, actual and paper, remarks on, 104.
Monotony, on that of Greek and Latin words, 185.
Monthly Reviewers, examination of their comments on Herder's Philoſophy of Man, 414.
Morals, of the faſhionable world, remarks on, 208.
More, Mrs. cenſured for her conſequential ſilence 40.
Mountains, a new theory of, 406.
Murders, number of, committed in Paris in ten months, 283.
Muſic, religious and prophane, its great utility, and antiquity in England, 338—remarks on that of the ancients, ibid.
Nations, on the obſcurity of their ancient hiſtory, and the partiality of its inveſtigators, 455.
Navigation act, ſerious conſequences of its ſuſpenſion, 92.
Near Obſerver, refutation of his ſophiſtry, 87—his acquaintance diſowned by Mr. Addington, ib.—his anſwer to the charge of deliberate falſhood, 89
New Teſtament, ſtrictures on Michaelis's Introduction to it, 127.
————, why expoſed to the moſt wilful corruptions, 133.
————, on the ſtyle of different verſions of, 136—on the various Greek manuſcripts of, 137.
Newſpapers, Engliſh, attempt made by Buonaparte's agents to bribe their owners, 60.
Nobleman laudable exertions of one, in ſupport of the vice ſociety, and their conſequences, 101.
Only, on the proper uſe of that adverb, 276.
Overton, Mr refutation of his ſtrictures on Mr. Daubeny, 175.
Oxford immenſe number of ſcholars at that University in the 13th century, and cauſe of their decreaſe, 339.
Palais Royal, account of, 59.
Papiſts, Iriſh, reflections on their principles, views and conduct 420-426.
Patriotiſm, new way of accounting for it, 405.
Peace, on the violation of the laſt, by Buonaparte 81.
Pearl fiſheries, proceſs of diving at, deſcribed 114.
Pearls, method of extracting them from oyſters, 116.
Peaſantry of France, their ſtate at preſent better than before the revolution eſtabliſhed, 56, 57.
Perception and Senſation, on the diſtinction between, 460.
Perjury, remarks on the ſin of, 159.
Perſia, obſervations on the primitive inhabitants of that country, 167.
Peſaro, a ſenator of Venice, his conduct on the approach of the French forces, 188.
Philoſophy, German, curious ſpecimens of, 413.
Plague, ſingular caſes of that diſorder, 386.
Plays, at ſchool, Dr. Barrow's opinion of their immoral tendency, 83.
Players, high opinion of, and eulogium on their qualifications by one of their priviledged members, 213.
POETRY—Matilda, the Lady of the Manor, 45—Delirium, ibid —Sonnet to the author of the Pleaſures of Solitude, by Mr. Polwhele. 200—Epigrams on Gallia and the Correſpondfng Society, 438—on modern dramas, valuable abſence, and Buonaparte, 439.
Polygamy, ſingular ſpecies of in Tibet, 167.
Popery, cauſes of its preſent increaſe, 212.
————, Mr. Locke's obſervations on its intolerant ſpirit, 329.
Popiſh prieſts, account of enormities committed by different foreigners under their influence, 326.
Population of the globe, conjectures on the groſs amount of it. 165.
Portalis, Citizen, ſome account of him, 284.
Prayer, daily, increment to in private families. 158
Preachers, faſhionable, account of, 208.
Price, Dr. his eulogium on the French revolution, 223.
Pronunciation of Greek and Latin, critical obſervations on, 183.
Raynal, Abbe de, ſome account of, and his works, 453.
Redeſdale, Lord, proofs of the high eſteem in which he was held by the Iriſh Catholics, 319
Reformers, (religious) their character, by Mr. Daubeny, 178—the original not Calviniſts, 179
Regeneration, interpretation of that word, recommended to Methodiſts, 129.
Religion, ſtate of, in France, 284.
Rhone, its magnificence, as deſcribed by Bourrit, 19.
Richard II. conjectures on his murder, and defence of his character, 347.
Robberies, amount of in Paris, in ten months, 283.
Romance, plan and features of that, of the 13th century, 233.
Romiſh religion, policy of its addreſs to the ſenſes, 234.
Ruhnken, David, biographical account of, 479
Rumford, Count, his houſhold arrangement deſcribed, 471.

Sabbath,

Sabbath, ſtrictures on its obſervance amongſt perſons of faſhion, 211.
Sacrament, propriety of, frequent invitations to receive it, 98
Sacrament of confeſſion, the Romiſh, great utility of that ceremony, 237.
Scenery, picturesque, its impreſſions upon poets and painters, 466.
Schamaniſm, ſketches of that religion, 163.
Schiſm, its heinouſneſs expoſed, 361.
Scythians, account of their early conqueſts, 169.
Senſation and Perception, on the diſtinction between, 465.
Sermon, not to be preferred to prayers in divine ſervice, 362.
Shakſpeare indebted to Chaucer for his ſtory of Troilus and Creſſida, 344.
Sheridan, Mr. his leſſons of faſhionable morality and new appointment, 211.
Siam, erroneous ſtatements of its population, 167.
Siege of Troy, various authors who recorded that ſtory, 343
Sin, original, Calviniſtic doctrine of, 492.
Slavery when preferable to liberty, 451.
Society of the ſuppreſſion of Vice, its preſent arrangements, and the reſult of its labours, 70.
Spaniards, reflections on their horrid cruelties in America, 272
Stage, its advantages in modern female education, 210.
Stage-coaches, deſcription of thoſe about London, 470.
Stephen, St. evidence of his inſpiration, 131.
St. Domingo, cauſes of the late revolutions in that iſland,
St. Paul and St. James their doctrines on Juſtification reconciled, 36.
Students of divinity, intereſting addreſs to, 182
Style, ludicrous attention to, by a dying French author, 452.
Suicides, number of, committed in Paris in ten months, 282.
Switzerland, reflections on the wonders of that country, 19.
Synonymes, difficulty of comprehending their various ſhades, 367.
Tailor-bird of India, account of, 126.
Tallien, his character by Holcroft, 294.
Tapeſtry, the celebrated, of Bayeux, account of, 338
Tartary, Chineſe, its prodigious extent, climate &c 166
Teſtaments, New and Old, remarks on their authenticity, and the objections of ſectaries againſt them, 9—coincidence of accounts in them, 11.
Theatres, ſchools for the elements of vice, 210.
Theatrical impropriety, its frequent occurrence in the French drama, 171.
Thelwall the orator, his character, 246.
Tibet, ſingular ſpecies of polygamy practiſed in that country, 167.
Toleration act, a ſhameful abuſe of it pointed out, 102
Tranſlation why deemed an honourable employment by the ancients, 343.
Tranſportation, without trial, inſtances of, for trivial offences, by order of Buonaparte, 289.
Univerſities, Engliſh, defence of them againſt the arguments of Gibbon, Smith, and Knox, 85.
———, of Oxford and Cambridge, their amazing proſperity in the 13th century, 339
Vaillant's Travels, their authenticity queſtioned by Mr. Barrow, 142
Venice, degraded ſtate of its government in 1796, 190—account of its fall. 191.
———, intrigues of the French Directory, previous to the fall of that republic, 193.
———, conduct of its government towards France, and return made by Buonaparte, 187.
Verſification, remarks on that kind, uſed by the ancients, in which the words are ſplit, 134.
Virgil, new illuſtration of a paſſage in that author, 436.
Volney, reaſon for the aſſertion of that author, that the ancient Egyptians were negroes, 274
Volunteers, their excurſions on the Sabbath-day condemned, 203
———, their general character vindicated, 330.
Vallere Mademoiſelle de account of, 399.
Volunteer cavalry, the probable manner in which it will be employed in invaſion, 400
Wall the great of China conjectures reſpecting it and the opinions of different authors contraſted, 165
War, literary, its fury in France, and how terminated, 455
War, ſome reflections on 342.
War of 1793 approved of by the Britiſh public, 245.
Wars in Africa, remarks on their cauſes, 48.
Whyte Dr. ſacrifices himſelf to diſcover the nature of the plague, 367.
Wine, great quantities of which might be produced at the Cape of Good Hope, 148.
Worms in the legs, a ſingular diſeaſe to which Europeans are ſubject in the Eaſt Indies, 64.
Zuliani, a Venetian ſenator, his conduct and harangues on the approach of the French towards Venice, 188.

Table of the Titles, Authors' Names, *&c. of the Publications reviewed in this Volume, including both the* Original Criticism, *and the* Reviewers Reviewed.

ABICHT's Encyclopædia of Philoſophy 487
Account of the Proceedings at the Middleſex Election 390
Addreſs to Sir Francis Burdett on the Cauſes of his Defeat at the late Election 389
Aikin's Annual Review 107, 219, 307
Annual Review and the Flowers of Literature 214
Archer Thompſom's Faſt Sermon 200
A Word to the Wife 100
Barre's Hiſtory of the French Conſulate 107
Barrow, on Education 83
Barrow's Travels in Southern Africa 142
Biran, on the Influence of Habit on the Power of Thinking 465
Biſſet's Hiſtory of the Reign of George III. 211
Bower's Account of the Life of James Beattie 382
Blagdon's (Mr. F.) Letter on the falſhood and inconſiſtency of the Annual Review 214
Britiſh Volunteer; or, Loyal Songſter 396
Cauſtic's Poetical Petition againſt Galvaniſing Trumpery 390
Chaſy's Sermon on the War 100
Character of the late Duke of Bedford — Obſervations on the Correſpondence between Mr. Adams and Mr. Bowles 309
Chriſtian's Faſhionable World diſplayed 205
Clapham's Sermons, &c. 152
Cockburne's Account of the Death of Lord Camelford 213
Courtier's Pleaſures of Solitude 200
Coſtle's Alfred ib.
Corret's Origin of the Gauls and moſt ancient Nations 455
Criticiſm on the Edinburgh Review 416
Daubeny's Vindiciæ Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ (continued) 30, 173
Day (the) of Alarm 95
Defence of the Slave Trade 198
Dibdin's Introduction to the Greek and Latin Claſſics, &c. 264
Dietrich's Gardener's Dictionary 468
Ducheſs of La Valliere 399
Extracts from the Minutes of the Society of Ship Owners 92
Eyre's Obſervations &c. made at Paris during the Peace 212
Faber's Thoughts on the Calviniſtic and Arminian Controverſy 333
Fothergill's Account of the Tredouloureux 97
Fouchecour's Juvenile Dialogues 96
Godwin's Life and Age of Chaucer (continued) 221, 337
Gooch's Sherwood Foreſt 398
Gordon (Sir A.) on the Fear of God, a Sure Ground of Confidence 103
Gleig's Sermons and the Chriſtian Obſerver 491
Grant's (Mrs.) Poems and the Literary Journal 315
Hamilton's (Lord) Thoughts on the late and preſent Adminiſtrations 296
Hankin's Letter to Sir Francis Burdett on the indecency and dangerous tendency of his Public Conduct 306
Head's Sermon on occaſion of the firſt muſter of Volunteers 203
Herder's Philoſophy of the Hiſtory of Man and the Monthly Review 402
——— Adraſtea 485

Heliodora,

Heliodora, or the Grecian Minſtrel 397
Herries's Inſtructions for Volunteer and Yeomanry Cavalry 400
Heriot's Hiſtory of Canada from its firſt diſcovery 364
Highley's Galatea, a Paſtoral Romance 205
Hill's Synonymes of the Latin Language 367
Hinckley's Account of the Fall of the Republic of Venice 186
Hiſtory of Ruſſia 481
Holcroft's Travels through Weſtphalia, &c. to Paris 49, 279
Horne's Sermon on the Times 101
Impolicy and Impiety of Sunday Drills 308
Kant's Chief Principles of Philoſophy 488
Ketrow's Hiſtorical Memoirs on the Seven Years War 473
Kleim's Auſtrian Magazine of Inſtruction for bettering the Condition of the Poor 481
Laguna's Edition of the Claſſical Writers 468
Lavallée's Letters to a Mameluke 169
Layman's (a) Exhortation to the frequent receptuon of the Sacrament 98
Laune's Deſcription of the Scenery and Adventures of a Journey by Land and Water 467
Larwood's Letter to Himſelf on the Invaſion 388
Letter to Lord Hamilton on the occaſion of his late Pamphlet, &c. 305
Life of Napoleon 397
Linn's Powers of Genius 306
Lyman's Fables 471
Maclean's Excurſion in France 41
Macleod's Letters on the importance of the War 198
Magon's Inquiry into the difference between Specie and Paper 104
M'Arthur's Financial and Political Facts of the 18th century 76
M'Gregor's Medical Sketches of the Expedition of Egypt 385
Mercy's Eaſy Introduction to Wailly's French Grammar 96
——— Inſtruction-Book, containing the method of Teaching, &c. ib.
Michaelis's Introduction to the New Teſtament 1, 126
Montolieu's Poems 44
Moore's Sermon on the good effects of a United Truſt in the Arm and Fleſh, and the Arm of the Lord 203
Mudford's Auguſtus and Mary 398
Obſervations on the Importance of a Strict Adherence to the Navigation Laws 92
Paliſot's Memoirs of French Literature 449
Pearſon's Remarks on Juſtification by Faith 255
——— Second Letter to Overton 350
Percival's Account of the Iſland of Ceylon 113
——— Account of the Cape of Good Hope 61
Pictet's Three Months Tour through England, Scotland, and Ireland 469
Pinkerton's Modern Geography (continued) 13, 160, 266
Prevoſt and Blagdon's Flowers of Literature, &c. 214
Prieſt's Delectus Græcarum Sententiarum, &c. 295
Proceedings of the Society for the Suppreſſion of Vice 70
Pye's Dictionary of Antient Geography 106
Rees's Faſt Sermon 100
Reflections proper for the Times 105
Renouard's Hiſtory of the Works of the Aldi 460
Reply of a Near Obſerver 85
Revolutionary Plutarch 107
Robertſon's Sermon on the Duty of Volunteers 203

Ruſſian Miſcellanies 483
Sacred Hours 99
Sheridan's Univerſal Spelling-Book 96
Storch's Periodical Miſcellany of the Hiſtory of Ruſſia 484
Suhm's Hiſtory of the Danes 480
Theſpiad (the) 198
Thompſom's Military Memoirs 20
Truth's and Duties of Chriſtianity 100
Turpitude (the) of Treaſon, a Sermon 202
Vain Cottager (the) a Tale 203
Valerius's Letter on the State of Parties 94
Voight's Views on the Rhine 486
Volunteer's Guide 307
Walker's Key to the pronunciation of Greek, &c. 183
Webber's William Tell 486
White's Compendium of the Veterinary Art 277
Whitfield's Picture of Life, a Novel 203
Whittaker's Conciſe Introduction to the Latin Language 402
Williams's Pſalms and Hymns 394
Wilmer's Practical Obſervations on Herniæ 97
Winterbottom's Account of the native Africans 46
Wolfsiohn's Impartial Expoſition of the lateſt Objections and Reproaches againſt Judaiſm and the Jews 465
Wyllenbach's Life of Ruhnken 476

Titles of the Eſſays, Letters, Poetry, &c. *in the Miſcellaneous Part of this Volume.*

N. B. *For remarkable Paſſages, ſee the General Index.*

Buonaparté (on) 495
Correſpondents, Anſwers to 112, 224
Correſpondence between Lords Redeſdale and Fingal, with ſtrong and important Facts reſpecting the Principles, the Conduct, and the Views of the Iriſh Papiſts, and an Original Letter from Mr. Francis Plowden's, found among the Papers of an Iriſh Prieſt now reſident at Paris 316, 412
Comber's Vindication of the General Character of the Volunteers of the United Empire of Great Britain and Ireland 330
Errata in Preface to Vol. 17. 228
Erratum 464
Forbeit's Letter from Shrewſbury Goal 111
Literary Intelligence 224
Modern Dramas compared 495
New Illuſtration of a Paſſage in Virgil 456
On Gallia 458
Obſervations on the Remonſtrance of the Rev. Peter O'Neil. 522
Preſent State of the Preſs 224
Readers, to our 112, 332, 464
Valuable Abſence 495
Williams' (Miſs) Correſpondence of Louis XVI. 485